Restoration

REPRINT LIBRARY FAMILY COMPANION

Elijah Goodwin

Yours truly
Jerome Smith

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_Y0-ARQ-125

THE

FAMILY COMPANION:

OR

A BOOK OF SERMONS

ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS,

BOTH

DOCTRINAL AND PRACTICAL.

INTENDED FOR THE PRIVATE EDIFICATION AND COMFORT OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST, AND TO AID THE HONEST INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH IN FINDING THE TRUE CHURCH, AND THE LAW OF INDUCTION INTO THE SAME; ETC., ETC., ETC.

By ELIJAH GOODWIN.

Oh that my words were now written;
Oh that they were printed in a book.—Job.

CINCINNATI:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR BY
MOORE WILSTACH, KEYS & OVEREND.
1860.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by
ELIJAH GOODWIN,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of Indiana.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

PAGE.

THE NEW CHURCH.

He is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us. EPH. ii, 14..... 13

SERMON II.

THE CHURCH THE BODY OF CHRIST, AND HE, THE HEAD.

And he is the head of the body, the church. COL. i, 18..... 37

SERMON III.

THIS SECT.

But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest, for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against. Acts xxviii, 22..... 58

SERMON IV.

THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. Acts xi, 26. 81

PAGE.

SERMON V.

CONVERSION.

For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. MATT. xiii, 15..... 107

SERMON VI.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. ROM. v, 1..... 133

SERMON VII.

SANCTIFICATION.

For this is the will of God, even your sanctification. 1 THESS. iv, 3. 170

SERMON VIII.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things, of God. 1 Cor. ii, 10..... 190

SERMON IX.

ELECTION.

Elect, according to the foreknowledge of God, the Father, through sanctification of the spirit, unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. 1 PET. i, 1, 2..... 219

PAGE.

SERMON X.

BAPTISM.

Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. Acts ii, 38..... 252

SERMON XI.

WHAT SHALL I DO?

And when he had gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? MARK x, 17..... 301

SERMON XII.

THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS.

Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation? HEB. i, 14..... 318

SERMON XIII.

THE CHRISTIAN WARFARE, AND THE MIND OF CHRIST.

Forasmuch, then, as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind. 1 PET. iv, 1..... 343

SERMON XIV.

THE GRACE OF GOD.

Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom that can not be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. HEB. xii, 28..... 359

PAGE

SERMON XV.

WORDS.

For the ear trieth words, as the mouth tasteth meats. Job xxxiv, 3. 377

SERMON XVI.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept; for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. xv 20 21..... 394

PREFACE.

In matters of religion, a man should be able to give a reason for every act which he performs; and that reason should be such as would stand the test when brought before the tribunal of his own heart and conscience, enlightened by the word of God, and in view of the judgment-seat of Christ. Such are the reasons I have for publishing this little volume of religious discourses.

'Tis true, the world is full of books, and they are daily increasing in number; but it should be remembered that the population of our very extensive country is also rapidly increasing, and a taste for reading is constantly becoming more general among all classes. Then, books of the right character and spirit should be multiplied in proportion.

Again: A very small part of the book-making talent of the community is consecrated to the production of religious books. We have many new books on the arts and sciences, on history, travels, etc., all good in their place; and many of a much less substantial character, intended to amuse; but how few of the productions which are daily pouring forth from the press are

devoted to the conversion, justification, and sanctification of our fallen race!

And even much that is published in book form, on the great subject of Christianity, is devoted to the special interests of some religious party or sect, and is, therefore, so cramped and hemmed in on every side, by the creed of the author, that they fail to meet the holy desires and immortal cravings of a mind untrammeled by party feeling and human shackles, which stands out in the blaze of gospel day, enjoying the full-orbed light of God's eternal truth. Such minds desire books full of ideas drawn directly from the great source of all religious truth — THE BIBLE.

Such have I aimed to make this little book. It is devoted to the organization of the Church of God, the conversion and sanctification of man to the Lord, and to the formation and practice of a holy life. And, although I have learned much from others, and therefore am debtor to other minds for many important thoughts herein published, yet I have written as the Lord's freeman. No human laws, or ecclesiastical canons, were held over me while writing. I have only regarded the word of God, in determining what is truth. Hence, no one is accountable for the thoughts and principles set forth in the following pages but myself.

I have endeavored to make this a welcome and useful companion in every family. The person who is anxiously seeking a knowledge of the gospel doctrine of conversion, justification and sanctification, will here find much useful information, in few words, on those subjects. If he is disposed to ask the solemn question, "*What must I do to be saved?*" he will here find an answer applicable to every condition that can be imagined, all illustrated by New Testament examples. The reader will also

find many useful suggestions in this little volume on the subject of the Church, its Author, its origin, its Head, its laws and ordinances, etc.; also, on holy living, purity of heart and life, etc.

Another reason which induced me to write and publish this work, was the fact that, on account of laryngetis, contracted by exposure and much preaching, I was compelled to *partially* suspend public speaking during the present winter. Still being anxious to labor, as far as I could, in the cause of God and humanity, I resolved to prepare and publish this volume, desiring it to supply, in part, the place of my personal presence. I have written these discourses as nearly in the style in which I usually deliver my public addresses, as possible, and have endeavored to embrace in them all the leading ideas that I usually set forth when preaching on those themes; believing that if a person is benefited by hearing a religious discourse, on any leading topic connected with our holy religion, he may also be benefited by reading the same; and if one person may be thus profited, many may be.

My object is, (the Lord knows my heart), to do good. I have spent most of my life, since I was sixteen years old, in the service of the Church, and in preaching the gospel; and, although I have been a very weak instrument, I have some reason to believe that my labor has not been altogether in vain in the Lord. I love the cause of New Testament Christianity as sincerely as I ever did, and I feel as deeply concerned for the conversion of the world, and for the peace, harmony and purity of the Church of God, as I ever did; and am as willing to labor for my Divine Master as I ever was. But human life is short; "death at the farthest can't be far;" my days are swiftly passing away; my time of active service in the cause of Christ will soon close. I wish, therefore, to leave these discourses in a

permanent form, so that, when dead, I may still speak to the living on the great subject of human salvation.

And now, may the great Head of the Church preside over the destinies of this little FAMILY COMPANION, and make it a blessing to all into whose hands it may fall, is the sincere prayer of

THE AUTHOR.

BLOOMINGTON, Ind., January, 1856.

TO THE READER

You have in your hand, dear reader, a little book written by an humble man, of very humble pretensions, intended to do you good. It is composed in a very plain style, that it may be understood by all; for, to be useful, it must be understood.

The subjects discussed in the following pages are familiar; still, they are no better understood than they ought to be, and common though they be, they pertain to our interests in two worlds; they refer to things invisible and eternal, and, therefore, should never grow old.

A few of these discourses have been published before, in the *Christian Record;* but they appeared in small parcels, ir different numbers, so that it requires much pains to hunt them up and read them in connection. And then, but few persons get their pamphlets bound, and hence, the discourses that were published in that work remain in but few hands. Here they are collected together, and put in a permanent form for preservation. The sermons on the work of the Holy Spirit, and election, were written out as preached, by special request; and hence they appear in the form of public addresses made to an audience.

You will find some subjects treated of in this series of discourses, about which there has been much controversy in the religious world. In the investigation of these themes, I have endeavored to use great plainness of speech, mingled with much kindness and Christian love. I have written nothing that I do not most conscientiously believe to be true; nor have I omitted

In the second chapter he shows that the Jews have nothing to boast of above the Gentiles on account of good works. That, notwithstanding the Gentiles had "walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience," yet the Jews had had their behavior in the same way, "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature" (practice, second nature) "the children of wrath, even as others," as the Gentiles.

He then announces the great truth, that the whole gospel plan of salvation was devised and put into operation on the principle of grace, so that all who are saved, whether Jew or Gentile, "are saved by grace, and not of works, lest any man should boast," thus showing that the Jews had no constitutional rights in the gospel kingdom which did not belong to the Gentiles on the same principles. Now, while prosecuting this argument, the apostle penned the text which I have selected as the theme of this discourse: "*He is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us.*"

In the further investigation of the subject, we propose the following order:

I. Show what is meant by this partition wall, and its designs.

II. Speak of the breaking down of this wall, and the purposes for which it was broken down.

III. Draw some practical conclusions.

I. According to this order, I inquire, what is meant by this partition wall? This the apostle explains in the following verse, thus: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Then, the law of Moses, with all its rites and ceremonies, is what is here called a *partition wall.* Of

this law God was the author and finisher. He counseled with no intelligent being in the universe on the subject. He advised with no man or angel, as to what should or should not be law. He gave it from the thick darkness that crowned the smoking summit of trembling Mount Sinai.

But for what purpose was this law given? what were its designs?

1. In order that man may be saved, he must have confidence in God. He must not only believe that "*God is*," but he must believe that "He is a rewarder of all who seek him diligently." Heb. ii, 6. Now, in order that man may have this confidence in the Lord, it was necessary that he show himself to be a *covenant keeping* God; that all that he promises he will perform. Now, God had made promises to Abraham, saying, "IN THY SEED SHALL ALL THE FAMILIES OF THE EARTH BE BLESSED." Gen. xii, 3; xxii, 18. In order, then, to show to heaven and earth that God had kept this promise, it was necessary to keep the seed of Abraham separate from all other nations until the Messiah should come; or, as Paul expresses it, "until the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. iii, 19. Had not this been done, the seed of Abraham might have been lost in the ocean of human beings, and no man could ever have told whether the covenant was fulfilled or not. It might have been fulfilled to the letter, but the lineage being lost, the skeptic would always have had the advantage. Hence, in order to keep the posterity of Abraham separate from all other people, and thus to show to heaven and earth that the Lord had kept his promise to the letter, he threw around the seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob, the law of commandments concerning ordinances, and by it fenced them in from all the nations of the earth. This, then, was the first design of that institution.

2. But, in the second place, it was intended to hold that people in subjection; to govern them.

The Jews are always spoken of as a stiff-necked and rebellious nation. They were constantly inclined to run away from God. Hence the Lord treated them as the husbandman treats his unruly stock; he *fenced them in*. Hence the law is called a governor, under which the Jews were placed during their minority, until the time appointed of the Father, for them to be made free by the Son, that they might be free indeed, should come.

Peter, using another figure, calls this law a yoke, which, he says, "neither they nor their fathers were able to bear," Acts xv, 10. By a yoke, he means law, government: and thus shows that that partition wall was intended to hold the people in subjection to God. True, like unruly stock, they often broke over this wall, and ran away from God; but this does not disprove our last position in reference to the design of the law.

3. In the third place, the law was intended to teach that people, and thus prepare them for the reception of the Messiah when he should come.

The apostle says, "the law was (not *is*) our school-master to bring us to Christ," Gal. iii, 24. The Jewish nation was placed under the law as a tutor, to train, teach, and prepare that people, in heart and character, for the coming dispensation. In reasoning on this subject, the apostle said, "Now I say that the heir as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world," Gal. iv, 1, 2, 3. By this tutor, Paul means the law.

And I may be permitted to say, that there never was a more competent teacher than was this law. No teacher

was ever better qualified to accomplish the ends contemplated. That law, in all its rites and ceremonies, pointed to the gospel day; hence it is said, "the law had a shadow of good things to come." The loaves of the Divine presence, very fitly prefigured the Lord's supper in the Christian church; the golden altar and burning incense, were fit types of the spiritual devotion arising from hearts purified by grace under the reign of Christ; their bleeding, expiring victims, that bled for remission under that law, prefigured the great atoning sacrifice which was offered in the end of the Jewish age to put away sin. Indeed, their very Temple itself was a type of the Christian church, and every rite performed within its consecrated walls was intended to develop the mind, enlarge the views, direct the affections, and prepare the nation for the coming Messiah.

It may be asked, if this teacher was so competent, why was the nation so poorly taught? Why were they so poorly prepared to receive the Saviour when he came?

I answer: it is not every student that is put under a good and efficient teacher, that comes out an accomplished scholar. The student must be reconciled to the rules of the school; he must have some regard for his teacher; he must submit to the laws of the institution; and, above all, he must apply his mind to his studies. All these things the Jews failed to do. They fell out with their teacher; they refused to submit to his authority; they would not apply their hearts to his instructions; they added their own views of propriety to his commandments, insomuch that the Lord said, when he came, they had "*made void the law by their traditions.*"

To this general charge, there were a few honorable exceptions; and these were fully prepared to receive the Messiah. Good old Simeon was of this happy number. It is said of him, that he "was just, and devout, waiting

for the consolation of Israel." When Christ was circumcised, he "took him up in his arms and said, now Lord lettest thou thy servant depart in peace; for mine eyes hath seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people, a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel," Luke ii, 28, 29. Simeon saw salvation in this child for all nations; he saw, in the Infant Saviour, light for the Gentiles, who had long been in darkness, and glory for the Israel of God.

Now, the only principle upon which we can account for the striking difference between this good man and the great mass of the Jewish nation, is, that he studied his lessons; he obeyed his teacher; he satisfied himself with the requirements of the law, and was therefore prepared to enter the higher school, when the great Teacher, sent from God, appeared. And I fully believe, that if the whole nation had thus submitted to that school-master and governor, they would all have been as well prepared for the reign of Christ as was this good man. The fault was not in the teacher, but in the students.

II. I now pass to my second head of discourse, which is to speak of the breaking down of this wall of partition, and the designs for which it was broken down.

This law stood in full force during the teaching of John the Baptist, and of Christ and his disciples, until the Lord's death. All the reformation and obedience that John required, were to be performed according to that law. Christ himself lived under that law, and hence, when he healed a man of the leprosy, he told him to "show himself to the Priest, and offer for his cleansing those things that Moses command," Mark i, 44.

But when the great antitype, the atoning sacrifice expired, the law expired with him; when he bowed his head and died, the partition wall fell. Then it was, that he who is

our peace-offering, broke down the middle wall of partition, according to our text. Speaking in reference to this same matter, the Apostle says, he hath "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross," Col. ii, 14.

That this partition wall had now fallen, God signified by rending the vail of the temple, at the death of Christ. That vail separated the holy place from the most holy; it concealed from public view the most holy place of the temple, and might therefore be considered as an emblem of the partition wall between Jew and Gentile. But now the promised seed has come; the substance of all the shadows under the law, is now manifested; the Lamb of God, which had been slain in type from the foundation of the world, was now slain in fact; upon the cross on Calvary, he bows his head and dies, and the partition wall is leveled to the ground, and the vail of the temple is rent in two from top to bottom, as if God would say, we have no more need of thee: Christ has opened up a new and living way, through the vail of his flesh, into the holy place made without hands.

But, under this head, I am also to point out some of the designs of our blessed Lord, in breaking this partition wall down. Though these may be many, I will only mention two in this discourse.

1. The first design that I will notice, is spoken of in the context, thus; "TO MAKE IN HIMSELF OF TWAIN, ONE NEW MAN."

Now, by this *new man*, the apostle means a new church, having reference to the Christian church under the gospel dispensation. This new church was to be composed of believers from every nation under heaven; but this could not be while the partition wall between Jew and Gentile

stood. Therefore, before he organized the new church—before he formed, of the two nations, one new man—he broke down the partition wall between them. Thus, we clearly perceive one of the main objects of the apostle in penning this text. The Jews, as stated in the introduction of this discourse, opposed the reception of the Gentiles into the church; they argued that the law forbade it; that that institution stood as a wall between them and all other nations; and, therefore, for them to unite with men of another nation in religious matters, would be to overleap God's partition wall.

But, in answer to this, Paul speaks in the language of our text, saying; "*He is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of two, one new man.*"

From this declaration, it is clear that Paul did not believe in the modern notion, that the Jewish church and the Christian church were one; that they were identical. He does not say, that he who is our peace has come to reform the old Jewish church, and "enlarge its privileges somewhat." But he declares, that his object was to make a new man; a new ecclesiastical organization, the like of which never existed upon the earth before.

John the Baptist, the Lord himself, and the disciples, all taught the same doctrine. John "preached in the wilderness of Judea, saying repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," Matt. iii, 2. Thus did he announce the near approach of a new kingdom, or church. "And when he saw many of the Pharisees and Saducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance, and think not to say

within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire," Matt. iii, 7, 8, 9, 10.

John saw that these persons expected to obtain a place in the kingdom, or church of Christ, now approaching, by virtue of their relationship to Abraham. But he lets them know that, in that new organism, every man must stand upon his own faith and obedience; that every tree, whether of the seed of Abraham or not, that does not bring forth good fruit, shall be cast into the fire.

The disciples also were commanded to "preach, saying the kingdom of heaven is at hand," Matt. x, 7. And Christ himself "preached the gospel of the kingdom of God, saying the time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye and believe the gospel," Mark i, 15; thus signifying the near approach of a new church, and the necessity of a personal preparation for a place in it.

The Lord taught the same doctrine, both in parable and without a parable. On one occasion he said, "No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up, taketh from the garment and the rent is made worse," Matt. ix, 16; thus intimating that he had not come to mend and patch up that old garment, or Jewish church; but that he intended to make a new garment, an entirely new church.

Again he said, "Neither do men put new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved," Matt. ix, 17. By this parable, the Lord teaches that he did not intend to pour the Holy Spirit, with all its quickening, sanctifying and

miraculous power, into that old, mouldy, leathern bottle, or national church; but that he was about to make a new vessel entirely—a new church—into which he would put the new wine of the kingdom, the Holy Spirit, with all its Divine influences.

When Peter confessed the Lord, saying, "*Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God:*" "Jesus answered and said unto him, blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. xvi, 16, 17. The reader will please notice, the Lord speaks of his church as not yet built; he says, "*I will build my church.*" Of course, when built, it would not be the old church improved, but a new church altogether, called in the connection in which our text stands, *a new man.*

Jesus taught the same doctrine, virtually, to Nicodemus. This man was a ruler of the Jews, and, of course, occupied a high place in that old national kingdom, or church. He seems to have been well convinced that Jesus was the Messiah for whom his nation had long been looking. Hence he "came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do the miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." Now Jesus, no doubt perceiving the thoughts of his heart, said unto him, "*Except a* man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God."

This was a new doctrine to Nicodemus. It was not taught in the old covenant, on which the Jewish church stood, and therefore this officer in that church was filled with astonishment, when, for the first time, he heard it announced. The Saviour explains, by saying, "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom

of God," John iii, 3, 5. Thus the Lord teaches him, and us, and all the world, that he was about to set up a new kingdom, or church, so different from the old institution that its members had to be born over again in order to obtain membership in the new church. Flesh and blood gave a title to membership in the old church; but faith, that works by love and purifies the heart, gives a title to membership in the new. Natural birth and fleshly relationship give no privileges in the church of Christ.

Though a person, applying for membership in this new church, might prove that his ancestry for ten generations back had all been pious members of the church, yet he can not be admitted, unless he believe in Jesus, the son of God. He can not come in on the faith of father or mother, or god-father or god-mother. And, on the other hand, if the person applying does believe in Christ with all his heart, and is willing to submit to his Divine authority, he may become a member, though his ancestry for ten generations may all have been Atheists.

I will only name one other point of difference between these two organisms, and then close my remarks on this item.

The prophet, speaking of those who should become members of this church according to the new covenant, says; "and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord," Jer. xxxi, 34. Now, this could never be said in the old Jewish church. Persons were born into this church of their earthly parents, and therefore had to be taught to know the Lord afterward. Not so in the new church of which we speak; in it all were to know the Lord; they were to be taught first, and then to come in, being found worthy. Hence the Lord said to his disciples: "*Go*

teach all nations, BAPTIZING THEM INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY SPIRIT," Matt. xxviii, 19.

2. The second design that the Lord had in breaking down this partition wall, which I will notice, was to *make peace.* Paul says, "He abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man SO MAKING PEACE."

When the Lord appeared on earth, division and dissension prevailed everywhere. The Jews, within the bounds of the partition wall of which we have spoken, were much divided among themselves. There were the Pharisees and Sadducees, beside other minor sects among them. True, they had not carried their sectarianism quite so far as some professed Christians have done. They all worshiped in the same temple; they offered their sacrifices at the same altar, and presented their gifts through the same priesthood; they did not lock the doors of their synagogues against a brother Jew, because he belonged to a different sect. Still they were much divided. Every man knew to which party he belonged, and thus the peace of Zion was much disturbed. And then, outside of the precincts of Judaism, all was division. The Gentile world had multiplied their deities to over forty thousand. Every god and demi-god must have his altar and his priests, and these, by their teaching and mysteries, kept the people in everlasting contention. Such was the divided and distracted state of our world when the STAR OF BETHLEHEM appeared; when the great peace-maker from the skies appeared in human form. He came to hush to silence warring elements—to say to the raging waves of the ocean of human passion, Peace, be still; and to unite in one holy brotherhood those who had been long divided. Well might the angelic hosts sing, "*Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good will toward men.*"

But it may be asked, If Christ came to make peace, why did he say that he came to send a sword? Why did he say, "I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household"? Matt. x, 35, 36. Am I asked, how can this be reconciled with the idea that Christ came to make peace?

I admit that Christ did intend to draw one line of distinction—to mark out one division line, long, and broad, and deep—one that should be seen and known of all men. This separation line was to be, "between them that serve the Lord and them that serve him not." (I fear that this line is not as distinctly seen in our day as the Lord intended it to be.)

When the gospel was first proclaimed, some embraced it, while others rejected it; the father would sometimes become a Christian, and the son would not; the mother would embrace the gospel, and the daughter would reject it, and thus the family would become divided, until a man's foes would indeed be those of his own household. And this division was more than nominal. The unbelieving party would even deliver up the believer, though it were a father or a son, unto death. To this state of things, doubtless, the Saviour referred when he said he had come to make division. Still, his great object was to make peace, and to make it on holy terms. These terms of union were to be so well adapted to the ends proposed—namely, the union of all believers—that the manifold wisdom of God should be visible in them; not only to men, but also to "principalities and powers in heavenly places," Eph., iii, 10.

The apostle refers to these principles in the twentieth verse of the chapter in which our text stands. Speaking to

those who had become members of this sacred brotherhood, he says: "Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

Now, the constitution of any organized society is the foundation on which it stands. The constitution of the United States is the foundation on which this great sisterhood of States is builded; the whole political building stands on this platform; destroy the foundation, and the whole building must fall into a thousand fragments—or, to speak without a figure, the Union would be dissolved. (May so unhappy an event never obtain!) Just so, the constitution of the church is the foundation on which it was organized, and on which it was to stand while sun and moon endure.

But what is meant by the *foundation of the apostles and prophets?* This must mean the teaching of these holy men of God, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. Christ is called the *chief corner-stone* because these apostles and prophets taught as he directed. The chief corner-stone, in a literal building, is first squared and laid—and the whole foundation is squared by it. So, all the teaching of these divinely inspired teachers of Christ was fitted, and squared, and dictated by the mind of Christ, as revealed by the Holy Spirit.

Now, we have the teaching of these divinely-authorized witnesses of Christ, in the Bible, which contains the Old and New Testaments. Thus we have found the constitution on which that new church was formed. The Holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of God, was their only book of faith and religious manners.

The apostle gives a compendium of this foundation of union and communion in the following words: "There is

one body and one spirit, even as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all," Eph., iv, 4–6. These seven points embrace, in a compendious form, the great apostolic platform on which this new church is built or organized. All who acknowledged the one God and Father of all, and submitted to the one baptism, having the one faith, confessing the one Lord, came into the one body, and enjoyed the one spirit, and rejoiced in the one hope.

What a beautiful arrangement was this. How well calculated to unite the good of all nations! All national peculiarities were to be forgotten here; here the Jew was to be reconciled to his fellow Jew—the Gentile to his fellow Gentile—and the Jew and Gentile to be reconciled to each other; and on these divine principles to form the one body, and all in one body was to be reconciled to God by the cross of Christ, and thus peace was not only to be made on earth among men, but peace was to be established between heaven and earth, between God and man. Hallelujah! praise you the Lord.

But in every system there is one central idea—one fundamental truth—which may be regarded as the soul of the system, and which generally gives name to it. The sun is the central body in the system of worlds to which we belong, and from that body of light the system receives its name—the *solar system.*

The same is true in all systems of human government. The central idea in the constitution of the United States is expressed in these words: "All men are born free and equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." Now, the whole constitution is framed in reference to this one great truth; and all the national and State laws of the government must be in accordance therewith,

and designed to maintain to every citizen that freedom which this simple declaration expresses.

So, in all ecclesiastical organisms; each has its own central idea. In one, that central idea is government by the congregation, so that body is called Congregationalists. In another, the central thought is government by the bishops, and the whole polity is organized accordingly, and the body is called Episcopalian—from *episkopos*, translated *bishop*, in the King's version of the Holy Scriptures. In a third, the central idea is government by the presbytery, or eldership, and so this body is called Presbyterians—from *presbuteros*, translated *elder* in the common version.

Well, in the constitution of the new man, or church, which Christ built, there is also one central idea—one all-pervading truth—which may be regarded as the soul of the system. That central idea or truth is, that JESUS OF NAZARETH IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD.

"When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am? And they said, some say that thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. And Jesus answered and said unto him: Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and *on this rock I will build my church*, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt., xvi, 13-18.

It is worthy of remark, that in this address to Peter, the Lord changes the gender. He says, Thou art Peter, *Petros*, (which is masculine); and on this rock, *Petra*, (which is feminine), I will build my church. Now, the Greek word

αληθεια, alecthia, which means truth, is also feminine. This shows that Christ did not intend to build his church on Peter, but on the great truth which he had just confessed. This truth, then, is the central idea in the kingdom of Jesus Christ. And hence, the *one Lord* is placed, by the apostle, in the center of the apostolic platform, upon which the unity of the spirit is to be obtained and maintained. Read the seven items again, in Eph. iv, 5, 6, 7.

This truth is so interwoven with the whole revelation of God to man, that when it is believed, the whole system is believed with it. Hence the importance which is attached to this one article of faith, in the Holy Scriptures. When the Ethiopian desired to come into this sacred union, by baptism, "Philip said unto him, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*" Acts viii, 37. On this confession of faith, Philip baptized him, and he went on his way rejoiced. Why did not Philip ask him if he believed in the one God and father of all? if he had the one faith? if he believed in the one body? or desired to enjoy the one spirit and one hope? Because no one could consistently acknowledge the one Lord, and reject these other items in the great platform on which Christ came to make peace.

Concerning those who had come into this bond of peace, Paul says: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii, 28. Again: "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all." Col. iii, 11.

Thus we have ascertained the principles upon which the Christian church was formed. But when was it organized? When did it obtain a visible existence?

The materials for this new building were being prepared during the whole of Christ's ministry upon earth. Indeed, John the Baptist came to prepare the way for this new kingdom. All before the day of Pentecost was but the work of preparation; but on that memorable day, the church received a visible form—or, to speak in modern style, it was organized.

This fact gives to this day an unusual importance. On this important occasion, the first additions to this church, the *new church*, that ever obtained, were made. This may be regarded as the birth-day of the church of Jesus Christ. This is reason enough for any people desiring to stand on apostolic ground, to be often found referring to that day. If all the mighty reformers that have arisen in the last three hundred years had taken their first lessons from Pentecost, and remained longer in the school of the holy Twelve, the multiplied divisions which have marred the work of God, and defaced the glory of the church, could never have obtained.

III. I now proceed to my third head of discourse, which is, to draw some practical conclusions from the facts which have been developed.

1. My first conclusion, drawn from the premises now before me, is, that God never had two churches, diverse one from the other, at the same time. That many individual congregations were organized at different points, for the sake of convenience, in the days of the apostles, is true; but these all belonged to the one body—they all had the same constitution and laws, namely, the teaching of the apostles and prophets of Christ, and that alone. This joined them all together, so that our conclusion remains true. The Lord did not organize two different churches, on different constitutions, to be called by different names, and governed by different laws, and both to stand at the same

time. He did not make the one new man while the old one lived. He did not organize the Christian church by the side of the Jewish, and tell the members to maintain their distinct and separate organizations, but still to love one another, and be as friendly as possible! No, verily! Before he organized the new church, he tore down the old one; he took its constitution out of the way, nailing it to the cross, that all legal barriers to an entire union of all believers might be removed, and that all necessity for two separate church organizations might be done away. Thus did God show to heaven and earth that he intended to have but one church standing at the same time.

2. My second conclusion is, that if ever God proposes to make a new church, he will give the constitution and enact all the laws for it, and appoint all its ordinances.

I come to this conclusion from the fact that he always has done so. When he was about to organize the Jewish nation into a church, or congregation, he did not tell Moses to assemble the elders of Israel together for the purpose of legislating for his people. He reserved all the legislative power to himself. The only matter referred to them was, whether they would keep the law. "And they said, All that the Lord said will we do, and be obedient." Ex., xxiv, 7.

So, when he made the new man, or Christian congregation, he gave it all its laws. He assembled no general council, either of men or angels, to draft a constitution and enact laws for his church. He spoke, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast. He consulted his own will alone on the subject, and gave just such laws and ordinances as he saw would be best calculated to perfect the man of God, and thoroughly furnish him unto all good works Now, judging the future from the past, is it not reasonable to conclude that if the good Lord should ever propose to

organize another church, he will still hold all the legislative power in his own hands? That he will frame its constitution, enact its laws, and appoint all its ordinances? Most surely he will, as long as he reigns King of kings, and Lord of lords.

3. My third conclusion is, that if God should ever give organic laws for a new church, he will accompany the giving and promulging of those laws with such miraculous gifts and divine manifestations as will leave no doubt as to their divine origin.

When he gave his law to his ancient people, he did not require them to receive it on the mere testimony of Moses. He did not leave the elders of Israel to guess or imagine, from secret impulses, what was the mind of God as to legal requirements. But the Lord communed with Moses from the thick darkness which overspread the mount of God; while the earth trembled, and the voice of words was heard, and the sound of a trumpet waxing louder and louder, until the affrighted hosts of Israel withdrew from the trembling, burning, smoking, Mount Sinai, and entreated that the words should not be spoken to them any more. See Heb., xii, 18, 19. These awfully grand and terrific scenes were intended to show that it was none other than God who gave that law; it was Jehovah's testimony to the divine authenticity of the law.

And when the constitution and laws of the new man, or Christian church, were given, they were attested by divine power. Even the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus was proved by his doing such works as no other man had ever done. And after he was crowned Lord of all, and the time came to organize the New Testament church, "suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire;

and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance." Thus did the divine power testify to the sacred origin of this new church. And then, during the entire ministry of these prime ministers of the kingdom of Christ, God "bore them witness, by signs and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his will," (Heb. ii, 4), so that there was no room left to doubt the truth of what they preached. All who would reason honestly were bound to say:

"The work, O Lord, is thine,
And wondrous in our eyes."

Now, from all these facts, we conclude that if God should ever propose to build a new church, different from the one that was set up on the day of Pentecost, he will accompany the organization thereof, and the promulgation of its laws and ordinances, with such miraculous attestations as will prove its heavenly origin, and thus point it out as *His church*, in contradistinction from every other ecclesiastical organization on the face of the broad earth.

4. My fourth conclusion is, that *the church of Christ is no mean affair.*

If the whole Jewish economy was only a preparatory work for this church—if all the ancient prophets and seers of God spoke and taught in reference to it—if the whole ministry of John was only intended to prepare the way for it—if the partition wall, the law of commandments concerning ordinances, which had stood for fifteen hundred years, was broken down to make way for it—if Jesus died to blot out that old covenant which stood in the way of the Jews coming into the new church, and which was, therefore, contrary to their best interests—and if he sealed and ratified the constitution of this church with his own heart's

blood—it must surely be an institution of no small importance.

I awfully fear that many who profess faith in Christ have not a proper regard for the church of God. I fear many look upon the church about as they do on any human organizations, got up for mere worldly purposes. Hence, we hear men talk about "*the church of their choice*," or, of "selecting the church whose polity they prefer." Is not this treating the church of Christ as we do State governments and human organizations. Men choose to live in one State in preference to another, because of their difference in State polity. So, one man chooses to be a member of the Free Mason fraternity, but another prefers the I. O. of Odd Fellows. And how many choose their church about in the same way. Now, my dear reader, all this is well enough in reference to mere human organizations, but when we speak of the church of God, the subject is too awfully grand to admit of any such conferring with flesh and blood. In reference to his church, God has given no such volition; he organized it through the ministry of divinely-inspired apostles and teachers, and the only choice left us is, to adopt its constitution, submit to its laws, and become members according to gospel terms, and thus enjoy its blessings; or else to reject it altogether, and risk the consequences.

Reader, ponder these things well. Remember, we must all account to the great Judge of the living and the dead, for the manner in which we treat the "church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood."

5. I conclude, in the fifth place, that it is the will of God that all partition walls, or human laws which tend to divide the people of God, should be leveled to the ground. That the will of the Lord has not changed since the days of the apostles, will not be denied; and that it will not change

during the whole lifetime of the gospel dispensation, must be admitted by all. Then it follows, that if he broke down the old partition wall which he himself built, even the law of commandments concerning ordinances, for the express purpose of making one new church, that he might thereby make peace, then is it contrary to his righteous purpose to have his people divided and sub-divided into contending sects and parties, and kept apart by laws and usages which he has not ordained.

If these laws have not been attested by miraculous power, they are not of God, though they may have been enacted by the most august council ever convened since the days of the apostles, and if they are not of God, they should not be regarded as authoritative in his kingdom. And if they tend to divide and keep his people asunder, they should all be broken down, so that God's will may be done by his people on earth, as angels do it in heaven.

6. My sixth conclusion is, that every disciple of Christ ought to be a *peace-maker*. Christ was a peace-maker, as we have seen; and he says: "If any man will serve me, let him follow me." John xii, 26. To follow Christ, is to imitate him. Then, as he made peace, so must his disciples endeavor to do.

When the Lord would make peace, he did not omit any duty for that purpose; he compromised no truth for the sake of peace; he made no league with sin; he broke down all legal barriers which stood in the way of the peace and union of believers of all nations, and then laid down a holy platform of union—a platform composed of a few plain but mighty truths, truths which permeate the whole volume of inspiration, giving life and power to the whole system of human redemption. Upon these sacred principles, he formed a holy brotherhood, in which all was peace, and love, and joy, through the Holy Spirit.

Now, if we claim to be the disciples of Christ—to be learners of him—then should we labor to make peace on the same principles. We should endeavor to impress these principles upon the minds of all over whom we have any influence, both by precept and example, so that all may see their beauty, feel their power, and be converted by the truth, as it is in Jesus; that the peace of God may rule in the hearts and lives of all his people, both now and forevermore.

SERMON II.

THE CHURCH, THE BODY OF CHRIST, AND HE THE HEAD.

And he is the head of the body, the church.
COL. i, 18.

VARIOUS are the figures employed by the inspired writers for the purpose of illustrating that religious organism which is called "The church of God, the ground and support of the truth;" and in every such figure, Christ is spoken of as supreme. Are the members of the church represented as branches of a living vine? Then he is the vine. Is the church represented as a flock of sheep? Then he is the good shepherd, who even gives his life for the sheep. Is the church spoken of as a kingdom? Then he is the king who reigns over that kingdom. Is the church represented under the figure of a body, as in our text? Then he is the head of that body. In all things, therefore, he should have the preëminence.

This is not the only scripture in which Christ is represented as the head of the church. To the Corinthians, Paul says: "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ." 1 Cor. xi, 3. To the church at Ephesus, he says: "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church, and he is the Saviour of the body." Eph. v, 23. Again: God "hath given him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. i, 22.

My design, in this discourse is to speak of the church as

the body of Christ, and of Christ as the head of this body, in doing which, I propose the following order:

I. Speak of the character of Christ, the head of the church.

II. Speak of the church under the figure of a body; our physical organization.

III. Notice the union that exists between the head and the body.

IV. Close with practical conclusions, drawn from the premises which will, by that time, be before our minds.

I. According to this order, we are first to notice the character of him who is the head of the Church.

1. The dignity of his divine character is clearly indicated by the works which are ascribed to him. In the context, it is said: "By him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him," ver. 16. Again: "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made," John i, 3.

Surely, no power short of the power of God could perform such stupendous works. Indeed, finite minds can not comprehend this mighty creation; how then could a finite mind contrive it, or a finite hand execute it? Contemplate, gentle reader, the vastness of creation. What a world is this which we inhabit! with all its mighty mountains; its roaring and muttering volcanoes, ever and anon belching forth rolling torrents of burning lava. Behold its wide spread plains, its deep rolling rivers, and its mighty oceans, whose mountain waves are ever lashing the shore at the feet of the awe-stricken beholder. Then contemplate the innumerable tribes of living beings, formed to inhabit every part of this mighty world of ours; the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea: but, above all,

contemplate man, made in the image of God; and then remember that *all*, all were created by him who is the head of the Church, and we may form some very faint idea of his glorious character.

But our little world is but a speck in creation; as but a grain of sand on the sea-shore, compared with the immensity of the created universe. The sun, moon, and stars are the works of his fingers; he "in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of his hands." Heb. i, 10. Imagine every fixed star—even those that can only be seen by the aid of our largest and most powerful telescopes—to be a sun, placed in the center of a system of worlds, all performing their annual revolutions around their respective suns; then imagine all these worlds, with their innumerable hosts of living inhabitants, to be but a very small portion of the workmanship of his almighty power; and then think how glorious must he be who is the head of the Church and the Saviour of the body.

2. But the scriptures teach that he not only made all all things, but that he upholds all things. In connection with our text, Paul says, "he is before all things, and by him all things consist," ver. 17. Again, the same apostle says: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and *upholding all things* by the word of his power," etc. Heb. i, 1, 2, 3. The apostle here seems to represent the power of Christ as a mighty arch, reaching from eternity past to eternity to come; or spanning that broken off fragment of eternity which we call time; upon which arch is suspended the universe, all borne

up or upheld by him "whom God hath given to be head over all things to the church." Surely he is no superhuman or super-angelic being. He who created all things, and who upholds all things, must be divine.

3. But the very term which expresses divine nature, is applied to Jesus, the Christ.

John says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the *Word was God.*"—"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." John, i, 1–14. Now, it can not be that this title, God, is applied to our Lord Jesus, merely on account of any delegated power or authority which he may have received from the Father; nor on account of any office that may have been conferred upon him. In such cases, it might be said that he was *as God;* but it is here declared that he *was God*, and that he was God in the beginning. This title, then, must be applied to him, in reference to his divine nature. Just say that Jesus Christ is God in nature, and all is plain. It does seem to me, much of the controversy concerning the Godhead of our blessed Redeemer, might have been saved by this common sense, and I will say, scriptural view of the subject. Instead of contending that the Father and Son are one individual being, or personage, as some have been understood to do, let it be maintained that the unity is in nature—and I think but few who receive, as divinely inspired, the teachings of the apostles of Christ, will object. But let him object that will, such is the truth in the case. THEOS may be regarded as the name of a nature—divine nature—and *anthropos* as the name of human nature. Now, these two natures were, undoubtedly, united in that wonderfully glorious being whose character we are now considering. Therefore, it was said of him, before he was born: "They

shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted, is, GOD WITH US." Matt. i, 23.

II. But I now pass to my second head of discourse, which is indeed the main subject on which I design speaking—namely: "*The Body of Christ, the Church.*"

1. One object I had before me, in taking the very brief view of the exalted position and divine character of the Lord Jesus, that I have done under the first head of this discourse, is to exalt the church in our esteem. As intimated in the foregoing discourse, I fear that we do not esteem the church as highly as we should: hence, the unceremoniousness with which persons frequently leave the church; and the little interest that many seem to take in the prosperity and welfare of the church.

Now, we generally estimate the worth and efficiency of a body, by its head. A human body may be strong, well organized and healthy, but if its head be idiotic, we attach but little importance to the body. So of organized societies; we look to the head for the honor and efficiency of the body. What estimate, then, should we place upon the church, when it is declared to be the *body of Christ?* If that glorious personage who is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person—by whom all things were created, and who upholds all things by the word of his power—I say, if this transcendantly glorious and divine being condescends to preside over the church, as its head—and permits himself to be regarded, by all the shining hosts of heaven, as the head of the church, and the church to be considered as his body—surely, the church of God is no mean affair; and to be a constitutional member thereof, is no small matter. O that I could make this thought sink deep into the heart of every one who may read this discourse. Are you, dear reader, a member of the church of Jesus Christ? How exalted,

then, is your position! How highly should you prize your relationship in that body, of which Christ is the head; and how should you strive for the health and well-being of that body! But more of this in its proper place.

2. The second thought that I wish to suggest, in reference to the church, is, that *it is a unit—the church is one.*

This word *church* is translated from the Greek word *ecclesia*, which literally means, "*assembly, congregation.*" *Ecclesia* is derived from *εκκαλεω*—I call out, *the called out.* So the term church, means a congregation called out from the world. This term, I admit, is applied in the New Testament, to individual congregations, such as the church at Corinth, the church at Ephesus, the church at Philippi; and it is applied in the plural form to the churches in Galatia, Judea, and Asia. See Gal. i, 2, 22; 2 Cor. viii, 1, 18, 23; xi, 28; Rev. i, 11, 20. In all these places, these individual congregations are considered in their individual capacity; but the term church is often used in a more general sense, as embracing all these congregations in one general body.

When Peter made the good confession, Christ said to him, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church," etc. He did not say *churches*, but *church*, in the singular. Now, no one will say that he meant the congregation at Jerusalem, to the exclusion of all other Christian congregations. Paul, reflecting on his former life, said, "I am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God." 1 Cor. xv, 9. He did not mean that he only persecuted one congregation; he persecuted the saints even unto strange cities; hence, he embraces the whole body of believers, wherever found, in the term *church.* Again: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the *church*, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word [or, as Dr. McKnight renders it, with a bath of water, and with

the Word], that he might present it to himself a *glorious church.*" Eph. v, 25, 26.

Now, in this whole connection, the apostle surely uses the term *church* in a general sense. And it is used in the same sense in our text, "*He is the head of the body, the church.*" Thus are all the Christian congregations contemplated, in the light of apostolic teaching, as *one church*—ONE BODY.

I do not understand from this that the apostle intended to teach that all these congregations should be united by any general council, or by conventional rules; or that they should be united in one visible head, whether called bishop or pope; but that all who believed in Jesus Christ, and submitted to his authority, and stood upon the apostolic platform—namely, the one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all—were, by these holy principles, united in the unity of the spirit and in the bond of peace, and were, therefore, to be regarded as ONE BODY.

3. My third remark in reference to the mystical body of Christ, is, that in the days of the apostles, when persons were prepared by faith and true repentance for a place in the church, they became members by baptism.

A reconciliation to God in all the feelings of the heart, and an entire reformation of life, are necessary to membership in that church. This change, or purification of heart, is effected by faith in the truth of God concerning the Christ, the son of the living God; and this change of heart produces that change of life which is implied in evangelical repentance. Now, when a person is thus prepared for this society, he becomes a member by being baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Paul said, "Know you not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?"

Rom. vi, 3. Again: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Gal. iii, 27. No one is, or can be, baptized into Christ literally, and yet in the scriptures just quoted, the apostle teaches most clearly that they were *baptized into Christ*. It follows, then, that they were baptized into the *body of Christ, the church*. Hence, all the members of this body were baptized, nor can it be shown that any person was ever regarded as a member of Christ's church, without baptism.

4. The next item that I will notice in relation to the church under the figure of a body, is, the union that should exist among the members.

This subject is often spoken of in the scriptures. The union of God's people was one of the great objects for which the Saviour taught, and labored, and died. It was the theme of his instruction, and the subject of his prayers. In one of his most solemn petitions to his Heavenly Father, he said: "Neither pray I for these alone [the apostles], but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John xvii, 20, 21. How near and how dear must that union be, if it resembles the union between God, our Heavenly Father, and Jesus Christ, the blessed Redeemer! We have seen in this discourse that they are one in nature; so should Christians be—all being partakers of the divine nature, through the exceeding great and precious promises of the gospel. And is not this as it should be? Should not all the members of a body have the same nature? and should not that be the nature of the head?

This union is often illustrated, in the apostolic teaching, by the union that exists between the members of a natural body. To the Ephesians, Paul wrote thus: "Wherefore,

putting away all lying, speak every man the truth with his neighbor, for we are members one of another." Eph. iv, 25. To the church at Rome, he said: "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." Rom. xii, 4, 5. Now, who can conceive the nearness of the relation that exists between the members of my physical body? This, Christian reader, is but a figure of the holy union that should exist among all the members of Christ's mystical body, the church. The apostle teaches that it is the will of Christ that all the members, "speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, who is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted, by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love." Eph. iv, 15, 16.

What a beautiful description this is of the human body, and how forcibly does it illustrate the union that should obtain among the members of the church of Christ, which is his body. In the natural body, every joint supplies its place; the members are fitly (not unfitly) joined together; the parts composing the joint all adapted to each other; and then these parts are joined together by ligaments that hold the members in a very near relation to each other. Then they are compacted together by the outside membranes; and then, by the effectual working of every part, the body increases. So should the members of the body of Christ be united. Each should supply his place in the body, and all "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," (1 Cor. i, 10), and then, by the effectual working of every part, of every member, whether preacher, pastor, elder, deacon, or private member, each working in

his respective sphere for the general good, the body, or church, will grow, and increase in moral power as it grows.

The apostle Paul speaks at still greater length on this same subject, in his first letter to the Corinthians. He says: "For, as the body is one, and hath many members, and all these members of that one body, being many, are one body; so, also, is Christ. For, by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one spirit. For the body is not one member, but many; if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body; and the eye can not say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor, again, the head to the feet, I have no need of thee." 1 Cor. xii, 12–21. So should all the members of the church of Christ regard themselves; all united in the bond of peace, and all mutually dependent upon each other.

But the apostle labors this subject still further. He says: "There should be no schism in the body; but the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." Thus are the members of my natural body united. If the lady's little finger is honored by wearing a gold ring, her head is honored; all the members partake of that honor. And if the most remote member of the natural body is pained, all the members sympathise with it. Thus it is, that when one member of the body is diseased, the whole body becomes enfeebled. Why should a sound member be enervated by a disease in another member? It is because "all the members have the same care one for another." The forces and power of all the members are

concentrated at the diseased part of the body, for the purpose of overcoming the disease and saving the member. So should it be with the members of Christ's mystical body. If one member is honored on account of devotion to, and usefulness in, the church, the whole body is honored by having such a worthy member in it; and hence, no one should be jealous of the influence of another, nor envious at their success in doing good.

And if one member suffer, all the members should sympathise with him; for, says the apostle, in making his application, "you are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Ver. 27. If one member is morally diseased, all should feel for him. Suppose a member of the church has been overtaken in a fault, and has stepped out of the way: the members should not turn off from that member with cold indifference; they should not speak lightly of him, and express their fears of his steadfastness, and their want of confidence in the purity of his motives. This is not the way we treat the members of the natural body. The influence of the whole body is exercised in behalf of the diseased member, to save it, if possible. So, the care, and influence, and counsel, and prayers of the whole church should be thrown around the erring member; yes, surround him with loving kindness, and make him feel that all are interested in his well being. Amputation is never resorted to in the natural body, until all hope is lost—until the very life of the body is jeopardized by its connection with a diseased, decaying member; and even then, it is a painful operation. So should it be in the church of Christ. Exclusion should be the very last resort, and never should take place until all hope of saving the member is lost, and until the very life, spiritual life, of the body is endangered by the connection of the offending member with it.

Such is the union which should ever be maintained

among the members of Christ's mystical body. Christian reader, what think you of it? Are you endeavoring to keep this union in the bond of peace? I fear that many who have talked, and sung, and preached, and prayed much on this subject, the subject of *bible union on bible principles*, do not realize a moiety of the holy spiritual union that the gospel requires. We have said more on this subject than any other people during the last quarter of a century, and yet we do not exhibit to the world any more of that union than we ought. I speak to those who have taken the Bible as their only rule for religious faith and religious manners. Do we realize all that nearness of feeling, that identity of interest, that warmth of soul, that oneness of mind and purpose that we have professed? that the Saviour prayed for? that the foregoing scripture quotations indicate? and that should always exist among the members of the same body? Ponder well these questions, Christian reader, and may the good Lord enable us to love one another, with pure hearts, fervently.

III. But let us now consider the relation and union that exists between the head and the body.

1. In all physical bodies which have animation, the head governs the body. This is emphatically true in reference to the human body, which seems to be the kind of body to which the apostle has more particular reference in this figure. The head is the seat of the judgment and will, by which all the members are controlled. One body, one head, one will, is heaven's order. One body with two heads would be a monster, and such would be one head with many bodies.

No body could act efficiently if the members thereof were governed by different and conflicting wills. This is the secret cause of all the divisions among the professed followers of Christ. There are too many wills to be consulted,

too many heads, too many law-makers. Now, if we acknowledge Christ as the head of the body, the church, our wills should all be lost in his; self should be crucified with him by the cross, and we should be buried with him in baptism; then we should rise to walk in newness of life, and in all our future actions we should be governed by his righteous will. Paul says, We have the mind, or will of Christ. This we have in the Holy Scriptures. To this blessed book then, we should always come, in order to learn the will of Christ; and having learned his will, we should not stop to confer with flesh and blood; we should not consult our own views of propriety, or the views of our neighbor; but we should do the will of the great head of the church, and leave the results in his Almighty hands.

2. I notice, in the second place, under this division of the subject, that the head is the seat of sensation—of sympathy. What is done to the members is felt in the head. The great sympathetic nerve, which connects with the head, divides itself into a thousand fibers, and runs through every ramification of the body, carrying the sensation of the smallest touch, upon the most remote member, to the head, in the twinkling of an eye; and by this means, all the members sympathise with each other, and all the members sympathise with the head, and the head sympathises with all the members.

Now, let that nerve represent the love of God shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Spirit given unto all the true members of the body of Christ, the church, and you have a very faint representation of the relation and sympathy that exist between Christ and his church.

I will only introduce two examples to show this relation; one of mal-treatment, and one of benevolent treatment.

After Christ was crowned Lord of all, and his body, the church, was fully organized, there was a man of much

influence and of great firmness and perseverance, who set his face against this infant body, and determined on its destruction. In order to accomplish his designs, he persecuted the saints, even unto strange cities. On one occasion, he himself says, "I received letters unto the brethren, and went to Damascus to bring them that were there, bound unto Jerusalem to be punished. And it came to pass, as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell to the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." Acts, xxii, 5–8.

Now what was this man doing? He had no idea that he was persecuting Jesus. If he had ever heard his name, he believed that he had been justly crucified, and was then in the cold arms of mother earth. But he was persecuting those who believed in Jesus, and who had become the members of his body; and Jesus says, YOU ARE PERSECUTING ME. As if he had said, I am in heaven, seated on the throne of the universe, and the members of my mystical body are down here upon earth, yet I know them: I feel every pain that they endure for my sake; they are as dear to me as the apple of my eye; you can't touch them, but I feel it; when you persecute them, you persecute me, and I hold you accountable for it, as if you had persecuted me face to face. How near, then, must be the union between Christ and his people! O how careful we should be as to how we treat the members of the Lord's body!

The next case to which we refer, is found in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. In this chapter, we have a very graphic description of the great and notable day of the Lord; that dreadful day when the destinies of men will be

settled for eternity. In describing the scenes of that final day, Jesus says: When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them, one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Now, mark well what follows: "For I was hungry, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me." Matt. xxv, 31–36.

O what a lesson this is for all who love the Lord; yes, and for those who love him not, but treat his cause and his people with contempt.

It seems that these righteous persons do not fully understand the meaning of the Judge; and hence they shall say, Lord, when did we see you hungry, and fed you? When did we see you thirsty, and gave you drink? When did we visit you in sickness, or in prison? We spent our days on earth, among the sons of men, while you were seated upon the throne, high up in heaven, surrounded by all the angelic hosts, who always delight to do thy will. How is it, then, that we have performed these acts of kindness and mercy unto thee? Reader, hear the answer, and let it sink deep into thy heart: "VERILY I SAY UNTO YOU, INASMUCH AS YE HAVE DONE IT UNTO ONE OF THE LEAST OF THESE MY BRETHREN, YE HAVE DONE IT UNTO ME." Ver. 40. Lord, help us to feel the force of that declaration.

When the Philippians sent once and again unto the necessities of the apostle Paul, they may not have thought

that they were administering to the wants of the blessed Lord; (see Phil. i, 7; iv, 14, 15). Onesiphorus, also, may not have considered that he was bestowing favors on the Lord Jesus, when he so diligently sought Paul, the prisoner of the Lord, in the great city of Rome, and refreshed him with some of the good things of this life. (See 2 Tim. i, 16, 17). But Jesus saw him, and regarded it as done to himself, and will reward him accordingly. Reader, do you always reflect, when you speak of christians, that Christ notes every word, as having reference to himself? The Lord sees our hearts, he knows our motives, and he will remember how we treat the members of his body—the church.

You can not treat with contempt a member of a natural body, without insulting the head. If you spit upon my little finger through contempt, my head is insulted; it would be regarded as offering an indignity to my head. So Jesus regards all the constitutional members of his church; hence the apostle says: "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Eph. v, 30. Such is the body of Christ. You can not offer an indignity to a member of the church, without insulting Jesus, its head. Hence, he says, It were better that a mill-stone were hanged about a person's neck, and he be cast into the sea, than for him to offend one who believes in Christ.

IV. According to my fourth proposition, I am now to close this discourse with a few practical reflections:

1. If we are members of the Lord's body, *we ought to love him most devoutly.* We have seen the attachment that he has for the members of his mystical body; and should not this attachment be mutual? We should give him the warmest seat in our heart's affections, and we should always show our respect for him and his holy cause, in all we do and in all we say.

2. *We should honor him.* The members of any body, whether physical, political, or ecclesiastical, should always honor their head; especially if the head be worthy. And I ask, what organism on earth has so worthy a head, as the church? What head has ever shown such interest in the well-being of his body, as the great head of the church has shown toward the body over which he presides? One witness hath testified that "he gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word." Eph. v, 25, 26. That is, he died for this body, that he might sanctify and save it; or, as Dr. McKnight renders it, "that he might sanctify her, (the church), having cleansed her with a bath of water, and with the Word." Now, if Christ has thus loved the church, should not the members honor him? They should not speak a word, nor perform an act, that would be a reproach to the great head of the church; but all they do and say, should reflect honor on the name and cause of Christ.

3. *Christians should love one another.* If all true christians are members of the same body, surely they should love each other sincerely, and always strive to promote the peace and happiness of one another. Read the following scriptures on this subject: "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." 1 John, iv, 11. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death."—"Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." 1 John, iii, 14 -18. "Seeing you have purified your souls in obeying

the truth, through the spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart, fervently."—"Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous." 1 Pet. i, 22; iii, 8.

Surely, the love here recommended is more than mere natural affection, growing out of worldly considerations. This love is to proceed from pure hearts, and is to be fervent—which means "earnestly, eagerly, vehemently, with great warmth, with pious ardor, with earnest zeal, ardently." *Webster.* This love to the brotherhood should be like the fire upon the golden altar in God's ancient temple. It should be holy, and be ever burning; it should never be permitted to go out. This will require much watching and prayer.

You remember, on one occasion the priests permitted the fire on that golden altar to go out. This happened on account of inattention on the part of these priests. So will it be with our Christian love, which should ever be burning upon the altar of our hearts. If we neglect this altar, and give our attention too much to the cares of this world, the fire of sacred love will expire.

You also remember, reader, what those priests did. They put unsanctified fire upon that altar—that is, fire that had not been consecrated and set apart to a holy or religious use.

May we not virtually do the same thing. That is, may we not kindle the fire of Christian affection out of mere worldly considerations? How often do we see this thing, called Christian love, confined in its manifestations to certain grades and casts of society. Is it not sometimes the case that our love to Christians is regulated by the fashions and etiquette of society? And how easily is such love cooled? A little inattention—even failing to return a

fashionable call—cools all the affection that once existed between church members. My brother, this is placing unholy fire upon God's altar.

And do you not remember the fate of those ancient priests who thus defiled the temple of God. Read in Lev. x, 1, 2.

God destroyed them for their neglect of duty and presumptuous wickedness. And should not all Christians examine themselves carefully, lest they be condemned at last? Remember, that if our Christian love is accepted of God, it must be kindled with a live coal from his altar; or, to speak without a figure, it must be inspired by the spirit of the living God; but this they can only obtain and maintain by a union with Christ, the head of this body.

4. *We should coöperate in all the interests of the church.*

That the body of Christ, the church, may be a healthy, growing body, it must be a working body. The strongest and most robust physical body would soon become feeble, without exercise. And an individual member may be kept in a state of rest until its power to act is lost. Hence, you always see active, stirring persons most healthy, and the members that are most used become the strongest.

So is it, spiritually speaking. The members of the church that never do much for the Lord's cause, never feel like doing much; while those who work for Christ become stronger and stronger; and are thus able to do still more and more for the prosperity of the Lord's cause. If this should meet the eye of a moral dyspeptic, I exhort him to go to work in the cause of Christ, and it will do him good.

But the thought that I wished to impress upon the reader's mind is, the necessity of coöperation among the members of this body, for the welfare of the body. I speak now particularly to those who have taken their stand on the *Bible alone;* who have united on the foundation of apostles

and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; who have become members of the body of Christ on Bible principles.

My brethren, should not the members of this body cooperate in all their general efforts for the enlargement of the borders of Zion—for the growth of the body, until it shall fill the whole earth? The brethren living in counties should form county coöperations for the purpose of sustaining the proclamation of the gospel in destitute portions of the counties. And districts and States should do the same. Why may they not? Are they not all members of the same body? And do not all the members of my body coöperate for the general good of the body? So may the members of the body of Christ. Nay, they not only may; but they are in duty bound to do so.

5. *The members of this body should keep themselves pure.* Speaking of the Christian's hope, the apostle John says: "Every one that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure." 1 John iii, 3. If the head is pure, the members should be. Hear the great apostle of the Gentiles on this subject: "Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them members of a harlot? God forbid! What! know you not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? For two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." 1 Cor. vi, 14–17. Thus reasons one who had the mind of Christ. Contemplating the purity of the great head of the church, he concludes that all the members should be pure—that it would be unjust, unnatural, and unrighteous to form such an unholy alliance between the members of Christ's body and the base character just named.

But, if such an alliance with one species of crime is wrong, the same is true in reference to all sin. How appropriate

Paul's command to Timothy, "Keep thyself pure." Shall I take the members of Christ's body, and introduce them into the ball-room? Shall I cause the Lord's feet to move in the giddy dance? If I do, do I not dishonor the head? Let every member of the mystical body of Christ endeavor, by divine grace, to "keep himself unspotted by the world," for this is one of the constituents of pure and undefiled religion.

6. *The head was raised from the dead and glorified in heaven; so shall the members be.*

Because I live, you shall also live, said the blessed Lord. "If the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii, 11. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." 1 Thess. iv, 14. Then the desire of the Lord will be realized. "Father," said he, "I will that they also that thou hast given me be with me, where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me." John xvii, 24. "Then shall be brought to pass that saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory; O, death, where is thy sting? O, grave, where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. xv, 54, 55.

Reader, are you a member of this body—the church of Christ? Then be faithful unto death, and the Lord hath said you shall have a crown of life. But if you are not a member of this body, O, be exhorted to come to the Saviour; believe on him with all your heart—confess his worthy name—reform your life, and be baptized into the body of Christ.

SERMON III.

THIS SECT.

But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for as concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against. Acts xxviii, 22.

In the last chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, we have an account of Paul's perilous voyage to Rome, where he was taken as a prisoner, for his devotion to, and his labors in the cause of Christ. When he was brought into Rome, it is said, "Paul was suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him. And it came to pass after three days, that Paul called the chief of the Jews together: and when they were come together, he said unto them, Men and brethren, though I have committed nothing against the people or customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem, into the hands of the Romans; who, when they had examined me, would have let me go, because there was no cause of death in me. But when the Jews spake against it, I was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar; not that I had aught to accuse my nation of. For this cause, therefore, I called for you, to see you, and to speak with you, because for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain.

"And they said unto him, We neither received letters out of Judea, concerning thee, neither any of the brethren that came, showed or spake any harm of you.

"*But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for as*

concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against."

The course pursued by these persons is somewhat different from that which is pursued by many in our day. Now, it is often made a reason why persons should not be heard, because the religious party to which they belong is every where spoken against. They now say, We *do not* desire to hear you, for as for this sect, it is every where spoken against.

These persons, however, acted on a different principle. They seem to say, Now, Paul, we know that the sect to which you belong is spoken against all over the country; we know that all parties oppose you; but we are not willing to form our opinion of you or your party, by what others say. Your enemies may not fairly represent you; therefore we desire to hear you on the subject. We want to hear an exposition of your views from one of the advocates of the system; from one of the leaders of this sect. Reader, was not that the more honorable course? Surely it was.

The term *sect* was not always as popular as it now is. It is used in the Scriptures, as well as in ecclesiastical history, in a bad sense. The Greek word translated sect, in the common version, is *hairesis*, which occurs, in all its inflections, but nine times in the New Testament, and is translated in the common version, *heresy* four times, and *sect* five times; which shows that the translators used the words *sect* and *heresy* interchangeably, as both signifying the same thing, and no one uses the term heresy in a favorable sense.

Greenfield defines the word thus: "Strictly a choice, or opinion; hence, a faction; by impl. discord, contention." Hence Paul numbers sects among the works of the flesh. In Gal. v, 20, he says: "Now the works of the flesh are

manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, laciviousness, idolatry, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, *heresies*, (*αιρεσεις*, *hairesis*), envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." Thus the apostle classes *sects*, or *heresies*, with the blackest crimes ever committed by fallen humanity, and even goes so far as to say, that "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

Webster defines the word *sect*, thus: "A body, or number of persons, united in tenets, chiefly in philosophy or religion, but constituting a distinct party, by holding sentiments different from other men. 2. A cutting, scion, (*obs.*)" Though this mighty lexicographer marks this last meaning of the word *sect* as obsolete, he does not tell us how long it has been so. This was doubtless its primary meaning. It seems to have come from the same root from which we have the word section, which means a part separated or cut off from the rest. Hence Paul used the term which is rendered *sect* in our text, to represent a party cut off or separated from the true church of Christ. The church of Christ is not, then, properly speaking, a sect; it is the body, the true church of God; while a sect would be a section, a fragment, cut off from the true church of Christ. This is our reason for opposing sectarianism. We believe that the mystical body of Christ is "ONE BODY," and that in this body there should be no schism; and that no man has any divine right to draw away a party from the original organism, and form a sect of them. This is heresy, *the* heresy so often condemned by the inspired writers. No doubt these persons used the word in this sense in our text. They were Jews, and doubtless they regarded Paul, and those with him who had embraced christianity from among the Jews, as a *sect*, a party cut off from the great body of the Jewish nation.

But in the further discussion of the subject, we will use the term merely to designate the body to which Paul belonged, and not to sanction its use.

I wish now to present a few plain propositions, in reference to the body of believers with which Paul stood identified. And in doing this, I do not intend to make one leading statement that will not be received as true by all who may read this discourse.

1. *This sect was every where spoken against.* It seems that all parties, Jews and Gentiles, all, all united in opposing this religious body. Though they could agree in nothing else—though they were at swords' points on every other subject—yet when this sect was to be opposed, they dropped every other question, for the time being, and made one common cause of this; one united effort to poison public opinion in reference to this people. And this is not the only people that have acted thus, nor is this the last time that such temporary unions have been formed, for the purpose of opposing the same cause.

Many hard things were said of these people. Let us notice some of them.

1. *They were charged with worshipping God contrary to the law of the fathers.* (Acts xviii, 13.) Now, this was a very serious charge. This, in our own day, would, in the estimation of many persons, destroy a man's religious reputation. Let it be said of a man, that he is introducing forms of worship contrary to the old established usages of the church, and how soon would he be cried down. The cry of Innovation! Innovation! would stop all ears against him, and his standing would be ruined. But this was said of Paul and his party; this was one of the things that was spoken against this sect.

2. *They were charged with heresy.* And this itself was enough to spoil Paul's influence with many persons. You

know, gentle reader, that this charge would ruin a man's Christian standing and character, in many communities, even in our own day. Just point at a preacher, now, and cry *heresy! heresy!* and you ruin his Christian influence with many. That Paul and his party were charged with heresy, we have already seen, from the meaning of the word translated *sect* in our text. On another occasion, when Paul made his defense before the Roman governor, after referring to their unfounded charges, and stating that they could not prove one of them, he said: "But this I confess, that after the way which *they call* heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers." Acts xxiv, 14. He does not acknowledge that he is guilty of heresy, but says that he worships in the way that they call heresy. This proves that they had charged him with heresy; and he admits, that if they are permitted to determine what is heresy, he would be condemned. And who would not be, even in this day of Bible light, and Bible liberty, if the accusing party is permitted to prefer the charge, explain in what it consists, and apply the law?

3. *They were charged with teaching customs which were not lawful for others to observe.* See Acts xvi, 21. Now, this was no small matter. For this charge, Paul and Silas were beaten with many stripes, and then confined in the dark damp dungeon. And even in our own day, this charge would ruin a man's Christian standing, with some of the stricter sects. The rules and customs of many of these bodies are stereotyped, and their forms have become fixed. Now, let any one introduce new religious customs in such a community, and the popular cry of—New customs! customs not lawful for us to observe! would soon destroy his influence. But this was said of Paul and his party.

4. *They were charged with turning the world upside down.*

Acts xvii, 6. And this might have been necessary, for the world may have been downside up a long time. Still, it was a very severe charge—one that was well calculated to destroy the influence of this party. By this they meant, that this sect was a set of "*disorganizers;* breaking up old ecclesiastical organisms, disturbing the quiet of society, unsettling everything, and settling nothing." There are men now living against whom these same things have been said, and they know something about the influence that such a charge has in stopping the ears of the people against a public teacher of religion. But all this, and much more that we can not now mention, was said of the religion party spoken of in our text.

2. My second general proposition in reference to this sect is, *that in the sight of God, this was the only true party—the only right church in the world.* Yes, notwithstanding all parties opposed this religious body, yet God acknowledged it; and it was the only church upon which he looked with approbation. To this proposition, I am sure no one objects. All say it is true. And should not this fact teach us to be very sparing of our condemnatory denunciations against any people claiming to be the disciples of Christ, lest haply we be found to fight against God? Thus, it often happens, that things that are highly esteemed of men are very lightly esteemed of God; while things that men disapprove and unite in condemning, are very precious in the sight of God.

3. My third proposition is, that *God never authorized the existence of any other sect, or religious party.* Are you ready to say that this is one proposition that you can not receive? But when I tell you what I mean by divine authority, you will not object even to this statement. By divine authority, I mean Bible authority. All the divine

authority that we now have for the performance of any religious act, is found in that blessed book.

Now, I ask, where, in all the writings of the inspired apostles of Jesus Christ, do we find any command for forming any other sect than the one that was at this time everywhere spoken against? Where do we find even a clear license, or divine permit, to do such a thing? Every Bible student is ready to answer, just nowhere at all. Then our proposition stands uncontradicted.

Now, if all this is true, and true it is, how important is it that we understand all the distinguishing peculiarities of that party. If it was the only right party at that time, and if God has never authorized the formation of any other religious party, we should surely be anxious to learn all the leading features of that sect. I speak after the manner of men. Feeling the importance of this subject, we will attempt to define that party—that old sect. And, while engaged in this investigation, I wish every other sect to be left out of view; let us draw a vail over every other religious party, and especially the various sects that exist at the present time; let us leave all these behind the curtain, while we attempt a description of that party that was every where spoken against, some eighteen hundred years ago.

1. *Their Creed.* When we attempt a description of any religious party in our day, the first thing we inquire for is their creed. And when we have found that, we have made a pretty fair start towards learning the distinguishing features of the party. We inquire, then, for the creed of this ancient sect. And by their creed, I mean their book of religious faith and religious practice. Was it the Nicene creed? You answer No, because that creed was not formed for some three hundred and fifty years after this sect had become so numerous as to be everywhere spoken against.

If then we unanimously decide that the Nicene creed was not the creed of that party, because of its youth, what shall we say of all church creeds which have been formed since? Not one of these can be the creed of that ancient sect; they are all too young, by many long centuries.

Speaking on this subject, one who spoke by inspiration said: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17. This is said more in honor of their creed, than to describe it; still, it points pretty clearly to the rule by which they regulated their religious practice.

He who is addressed in our text as one well acquainted with all the usages of this old sect, said of its members: "Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Eph. ii, 19, 20. Now, as observed in a former discourse, the constitution of a church is its foundation. Well, as Christianity is a system of faith as well as practice, all church constitutions express the faith of the church organized upon them. This expression of faith is called the creed of the church. Now, as this church was built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, it was organized upon and governed by the teaching of these inspired men of God, and by that alone. Thus, we have found their creed—namely, the Holy Scriptures, given by divine inspiration.

Now, to this position I believe there is not one dissenting voice in all the land. All, both Catholic and Protestant, agree that the church had no creed, no rules of faith or practice, at the beginning, nor for many long years after,

but the writings or teachings of the apostles and prophets of God. No controversy here.

2. THEIR NAME.

In describing a religious sect, it is very necessary to learn their name. Two churches sometimes adopt the same creed, and yet differ in name. I believe there are some five or six different sects that adopt the Westminster confession of faith. Hence, if you wish to know to which party a man belongs, it would not be enough to be told that his sect takes the above named creed. You could not tell from that whether he was a Covenanter, Seceder, or Old or New School Presbyterian. Hence we must, in such cases, inquire for the name of the sect. So, in pursuing our description of this ancient sect, we ask for its name.

I learn from their creed, the holy Scriptures, that they were called in their collective capacity the church of God, the church of the Lord, the church of Christ. See 1 Cor. i, 1; Acts xx, 28; 1 Tim. iii, 5; Rom. xvi, 16; 1 Cor. xi, 16. In their individual capacity they were called saints, brethren, disciples of Christ, christians. See Eph. i, 1; Gal. vi, 1; Acts xx, 7; Acts xi, 26. Now, to any of these titles they would answer. Call them *saints*, and they would respond, Here am I; call them disciples of Christ, and they would say, Speak, for thy servant heareth; call them Methodist, Presbyterian, Campbellite, and they would be as silent as the grave; but call them *christians*, and they would respond, Here I am; for though I suffer as a christian, I am not ashamed. Or should you speak to one of this old sect in reference to his church, he would say, he belonged to "*the church of God at Corinth*," (1 Cor. i, 2), or the church of the Lord at some other place.

Now this was name enough; these titles, or any one of them, showed precisely where those who wore it, belonged.

Having then found the name of this old party, let us consider—

3. *Their officers, and church polity.*

This is a very essential part, always, in giving a description of any religious body; for churches differ more in *polity*, or religious *politics*, than in any thing else. Hence, you have never fully defined any church, until you have pointed out the officers and polity of the church.

Let us then inquire into the officers of that sect that was every where spoken against. To learn the truth on this subject, we must go to their creed, the New Testament. From a careful examination of this Book, we have discovered that in that ancient church, there were bishops, deacons, and evangelists. The term elder, among them, meant older, or persons advanced in years—persons of age and experience—but as their bishops were all such men, this term is sometimes used in their book of faith and manners interchangeably with the term bishop. Hence, Paul "sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the church," to whom he delivered a very touching address, near the close of which he said: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." Acts xx, 17–28.

Now the word which is here rendered *overseers*, is *episkopos*, which is the same that is rendered bishop, wherever the term bishop occurs in the New Testament. We have a very similar expression in 1 Pet. v. 2: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the *oversight* thereof." Here we have the word *episkopee*, which is defined in Liddell and Scott's English and Greek Lexicon, thus: "An overseeing, charge; the office of an *episkopos*." Literally, feed the flock of God, exercising the bishop's office. Here, then, are two instances in which the *elders* are commanded to do the work of bishops, which shows that when the

teachers in that old religious party used the term *elder* as an official title, they always applied it to the bishops or overseers of the church.

In further evidence of this position, read Titus i, 5, 6, 7: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee. If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly; for a bishop must be blameless," etc. Why must the elders be of the character here described? Because a bishop must be blameless. Thus are the terms *elder*, *presbuteros*, and *bishop*, *episkopos*, employed to express the same office, or work.

The work which pertained to this office, according to the creed of this *sect*, was to oversee and feed the church; to provide for the spiritual wants of the flock of God; to rule well; to keep things in order, and thus exercise a general oversight over the church, watching for the good of their souls, as they that must give account. And to them, or to their decisions and counsel, the members of the congregation were commanded to submit. See Acts xx, 28; 1 Pet. v, 2; 1 Thess. v, 12; 1 Tim. v, 17; Heb. xiii, 7, 17.

In every individual congregation belonging to the body of which we now speak, where the proper character could be found, they had a plurality of these bishops, or overseers. 'Tis true, congregations existed for a time without such ordained rulers. Hence, Titus was left in Crete, to ordain elders in every city—which shows that there were churches in those cities—but there was something wanting; they lacked the proper overseers, and therefore, Titus is left with them, for the purpose of supplying this lack, by ordaining elders in every city. The same fact appears in the 14th chapter of Acts. Here we have an account of a general tour made by Paul and Barnabas, on which tour

they visited many congregations; and it is said, "when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed." Acts xiv, 23. I have quoted this Scripture to show that churches existed for a while, among the sect which was so generally spoken against, without elders; but it also proves that when the proper character could be found, they had a plurality of ordained elders in every church or individual congregation. Here we have the church in the singular, and the elders in the plural. The same form of expression is found in Acts xx, 17: Paul "sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the church—*church* singular; *elders* plural.

Some of these official elders seem to have labored in word and doctrine, or, preached the gospel publicly, while others did not. Hence, the apostle says: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine." 1 Tim. v, 17. Those who thus labored seem to have been particularly regarded as the pastors of the church—hence they were to have double honor. The word which is here rendered *honor* is *timee*, which occurs forty-one times in the New Testament, and is translated in the common version, *precious*, once; *sum*, once; *honor*, thirty-one times, and *price*, eight times. Greenfield defines it, "a price, value, a price paid, money, honor, *i. e.* state of honor, dignity, honor conferred, token of respect," etc. Most commentators think it means *price* or *reward*, in 1 Tim. v, 17: The reason why such elders were to have double pay was because they rendered double service; they spent much time, labor and means in their devotion to the church, and therefore it was but just that they should be well sustained in the work, that they might give themselves wholly to it.

One other remark in reference to these bishops. Their

official power or work seems to have been confined to the individual congregation to which they belonged. We never read in their creed or in their writings, of the *bishop* of the *churches;* but *bishops* of the *church.* See Phil. i, 1. Not one bishop to many churches, but many bishops to one church. Reader, don't begin to look behind the curtain—behind which we concealed all modern sects a short time ago. Let them remain out of view as much as possible until we have completed our description of that ancient sect which is named in our text.

2. *The deacons,* in this religious body, seem to have had the charge of all the temporal affairs of the congregations. In every organized body composed of flesh, and blood, and breath, there must necessarily be financial concerns. So, in the church of which we speak. The places where the congations assembled had to be lighted, warmed, and kept in order; this required money. Then the poor were to be provided for, and the Lord's table was to be furnished. All this, and many other contingencies, required funds; and this required men whose special business it should be to take charge of and oversee these matters. Such men were appointed in that old body, and they are, by common consent, called deacons. The word translated *deacon,* in the common version, is *diakonos,* which means "a minister, one who renders service to another, an attendant, servant." *Gre. Lex.* According to the "Englishman's Greek Concordance," this word occurs thirty times in the New Testament. It is translated, in the king's version, *minister,* twenty times; *servant,* seven times, and *deacon,* three times. But, it is worthy of remark, that they never applied this word to the bishops or elders of the church, notwithstanding they were servants of the church. Thus, it would seem that they intended by this word to express a particular class of servants. Such as served the church in reference to her

temporal affairs, were especially called deacons, though they may have also ministered the Word of Life to the people. The first account we have of setting persons apart to serve the church in this capacity, is recorded in Acts vi, 2–6. These men were set apart, by prayer and the laying on of hands, to serve the congregation, in raising, holding, and distributing the funds which were raised for the support of the poor, and especially poor widows.

3. *Evangelists.* The term evangelist comes from the Greek word *ūnangelistees*, which means, "one who announces glad tidings." To do the work of an evangelist, therefore, is to preach the gospel, or announce to the world the good news concerning Christ. Such was Timothy, Titus, and many others who, in the days of the apostles, went forth to proclaim salvation to the people, to convert sinners to God, and to plant christian congregations.

Now, what a beautiful arrangement this was. In every individual congregation were the bishops, overseeing the church, laboring for their spiritual welfare, settling their difficulties, instructing the ignorant, strengthening the weak, encouraging the fearful, seeking out and restoring the wandering, and building up all upon their most holy faith. Then, there were the deacons, superintending all the temporal affairs of the congregation; seeing that the poor, the widows and orphans, were provided for, and that all the contributions of the brethren were properly and judiciously applied. And then, there were the evangelists, going like swift-winged messengers of light, bearing the news of salvation to a dying world; turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God; planting new congregations, and thus enlarging the borders of Zion.

Thus we see something of the offices and order of that sect which was every where spoken against.

4. *Their ordinances.* In order to give a full description

of any religious denomination, we must always inquire into their ordinances. Some parties agree in almost every thing but their ordinances. Some sprinkle water upon their members, while others immerse their members in water. Now this constitutes a very striking difference, which would distinguish these parties from each other, if they were alike in every thing else.

Well, the church that we are endeavoring to describe, had its ordinances also. They observed one leading and important ordinance, which was sufficient of itself to distinguish this party from every other sect upon earth. I think I may safely say, that among all the various religious sects that then existed, or that ever had existed, human or divine, no such ordinance as this ever had existed. I ask, where was it ever known, that a religious sect observed a public ordinance in memory of the death of the founder of the party? The birth-days of kings, and of the founders of kingdoms and empires, have often been celebrated by public festivals; but did ever a nation thus celebrate the day on which a benefactor died?

Such, however, is the nature of that distinguishing ordinance to which I now refer. It is sometimes called, in their book of faith and manners, *The Lord's Supper;* sometimes it is simply called *the breaking of bread;* and sometimes, *the communion of the Lord's body, and of the Lord's blood.* See 1 Cor. xi, 20; Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. x, 16.

This ordinance was very simple in its form, but very powerful in its import. It consisted, simply, in giving thanks, breaking and eating of bread, and drinking from the cup the fruit of the vine, in memory of the broken body and shed blood of Jesus the Christ. There is one fact connected with the founder of this body of people, which accounts for this most unusual ordinance, and that

is, that though "he was put to death in the flesh, he was quickened by the spirit." Yes, he rose from the dead on the third glorious morn, and thus brought to light, life and immortality. Well then may his followers commemorate his death, since by his death and resurrection he has secured salvation from sin, and eternal life to all who believe in him and obey his holy commands.

Am I asked on what day they attended to this significant ordinance? They "came together on the first day of the week to break bread." Acts xx, 7. But do you ask on what first day? I answer on *the* first day. I can not learn from all the records they have left us of their customs, that they made any difference in Lord's days. The record does not say that they came together on *a* first day—or on *some* first day—but on *the* first day. As often, then, as the first day of the week came, they came together to observe this ordinance, and thus they commemorated two of the most interesting events that have ever transpired since time commenced her march, conjointly: the death of Christ for our sins, and his resurrection for our justification. This of itself was enough to distinguish this sect from all others.

This people practiced another ordinance, which was not so much an ordinance *in the church* as an initiatory rite into the church. This ordinance is called *baptism.* All the members of this sect were baptized. While defining this religious body, it may not be amiss to state that with them baptism was a burial. Hence, the apostle said, "you are buried with him by baptism." Rom. vi, 4; Col. ii, 12.

5. *Their manner of converting sinners, and adding them to the church;* or, to use a modern phrase, their manner of making Christians.

Their practice in this matter was quite different from most of the other religious bodies around them. The

apostle Paul speaks of their practice, in the fourth chapter of 2d Corinthians, first *negatively*, and then *affirmatively*. He first tells what they did not do, and then what they did do. He says they "renounced the hidden things of dishonesty." They used no unfair means to make proselytes; they did not "walk in craftiness;" they used no cunning trickery to seduce men into their party; they renounced all the secret tricks, and cunning craftiness, and hidden mysteries, by means of which the leaders of other parties deceived the people. (See Eph. iv, 14). They pursued an open, above-board, straight-forward course. They did not "*handle the Word of God deceitfully.*"

How may a man do this? What is meant by handling the Word of God deceitfully? I answer, by making it speak a language that the author did not intend; or convey a different idea from what the Lord intended to convey. This may be done by taking parts of sentences from different portions of the Book, and putting them together under another arrangement. In this way a man can prove anything he pleases from the Bible. The Scripture says that Judas "went and hanged himself;" and Jesus says, "Go thou and do likewise." Now this is all Scripture, and what does it prove? Why, that a man should hang himself. Now this is handling the Word of God deceitfully.

The same may be done by suppressing a part of a sentence. Example: "Let him that stole, steal." Eph. iv, 28. Now this is every word Scripture, and it proves that it is right to steal. But the apostle finishes the sentence with the words "*no more;*" "let him that stole, steal no more." Now the preachers in that old sect never handled the Word of the Lord in this way. They did not disconnect and scrap the Word of God; they did not handle it deceitfully, for the purpose of making proselytes. They gave God's Word fair play. By "manifestation of the

truth, they commended themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." They proclaimed the plain, unvarnished truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and thus, by "warning every man, and teaching every man," they reached the hearts and consciences of the people.

But when they thus reached their conscience, until they were pierced in heart, and asked what they must do, what course did these teachers pursue? What did they tell the poor, trembling, heart-smitten, anxious, inquiring, mourning seeker, to do? Reader, don't call from behind the curtain any sect now living, until we hear the direction of one of the leaders and teachers in the sect whose distinguishing features we are now endeavoring to set before you, given to persons in this very distressing state of mind. Hear it, reader, hear it with an honest heart: "*Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" Acts ii, 38.

Now what did these mourning souls do? Did they begin to object, and argue the case with the apostle? Did they begin to inquire what good there was in *water baptism?* No, verily. They were in good earnest; they were honest before God. Hence it is said: "Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized, and the same day were added unto them about three thousand souls." Ver. 41. Here, then, is a practical illustration of their whole process of making christians and adding them to the church.

Now we are prepared to contemplate this ancient sect in all its parts. It now stands out before us in bold relief. We have found its creed, its name, its officers and polity, its ordinances, and its manner of converting sinners and adding them to the church. We have seen that all who

became members of this religious body, heard the Word until it was commended to their hearts; and that they then repented of their sins, and were baptized. Mark this well. They were all obedient believers.

Now, I feel very confident that no man who professes faith in Christ, or in his word, will dispute one proposition that we have made, or one of the distinguishing features that we have pointed out in the religious party that we have been describing; unless it be the very last sentence which I penned in the description. But if any doubt the truth of that statement, we must leave them to their own musings, only requesting them to examine that proposition very carefully, before making a final decision.

We now have one important question to answer, after which we shall close this discourse. Does that ancient sect now exist? Is it still standing—or has it waxed old, like a garment, and vanished away? Have the desolating ravages of ambitious man—which have uprooted kingdoms, desolated countries, blotted from existence churches, and changed times and seasons—slain that old party of which we have been speaking? Has the ever rolling wave of time swept it away forever—or does it still maintain a visible existence among the myriads of ecclesiastical organisms of the present day? These, gentle reader, are important questions. If, as you have admitted, that old sect was the only right party at that time, and if there is no Bible authority for the existence of any other religious party or body, then it is important to know whether that party is dead or alive. We then repeat the question, DOES THAT PARTY NOW EXIST?

Yes, says the Roman Catholic, it still exists. Here it is; we are that same old sect, come down in regular succession from the apostles. We have the regular apostolic

succession, and therefore are the same body of people; and all who desire to be members of the real, genuine, old mother church, should join us.

But I hear an objection—a deep-toned, thundering voice, like the sound of many waters—crying out, *No, no!* we are the true party. We are the same old sect that was every where spoken against; we have the true and regular apostolic succession. This voice comes from the Protestant Episcopalian Church, or the *high church* of England. But if this is true, she must have changed her position since our text was written, for then it was the *low* church spoken against all over the country. But it is not my object to settle the question as to which is or which is not the true church. I only make this suggestion in passing.

I suppose, however, that it is a well known fact, that there is a controversy now going on between the Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, on the subject of the succession. Each seems to admit that if they can not trace their church organization and their ministerial ordination through an unbroken chain back to the apostles, their church fails to be the church of Christ; that it is an unauthorized sect; a figment broken off from the true church or body of Christ.

The Protestant Episcopal Church reasons thus: They say that the church is no more a new church after the efforts of Henry the Eighth, than a man is a new man when he falls into a mud puddle and then washes himself clean. He may look very different, but still he is the same man. So they say it was with the church. They admit that the church had become very corrupt; that it was much defiled by sin; but that Henry VIII., of England, cleansed the church, washing off its impurities; and that these excrescences gathered themselves together, and by some unholy principle of adhesion, formed the Roman

Catholic Church! This, however, is denied by the church of Rome. She contends that she is the only holy and apostolic church, and that Henry was excommunicated for his worldly ambition and fleshly lusts, and his want of fidelity to his legal wife.

But while these two great religious bodies are contending for the apostolic succession, each endeavoring to defend its title to primitive ground, I hear the muttering sound of voices, as of a mighty multitude all in confusion, crying out and saying, You are both wrong; we are the old sect; we have come down in a regular line from apostolic times. But when pressed at this point, I find most of them denying the succession, as claimed by the churches of Rome and England; and contending that every man has a right to make his own church, and found his own church polity!!

Reader, are you a Protestant? Then I know your course of reasoning, when you are examining the claims of the church of Rome to being the sect spoken of in our text. You first ascertain all the leading features of that old party, and then you compare these with the leading peculiarities of the church as it now exists; and if these do not correspond, you say the churches are not the same. Suppose, for illustration, that some leading member of the Methodist Church should assume that the Methodist Church is the real old Baptist Church, that had come down in regular succession from the days of Roger Williams. You would reply, This can not be; as a church, you have a different creed, a different name, different officers, different ordinances, and you have a different mode of receiving members; therefore, being different from the Baptists in all these points, it can not be the same church.

Just so, you reason the case with the Romish church. You bring up before your mind all the leading, distinguish-

ing features of that old church that was so generally spoken against in the beginning, just as I have done in this discourse, and then you compare these items with the corresponding items in the Romish church, and finding such a great difference, you decide that that is not the same church. You say the Romish church has a very different creed and system of church polity from that old sect; that it is different in name; and as to officers, it has swarms of these that were unknown in that old church; and as to ordinances, you say there is no resemblance between them at all. Now, you say, with all these differences, it can not be the same church.

In all this, my dear reader, you are correct. Your reasonings are logical and fair, and your conclusions just and true.

Now, all that we ask of one who may be desirous to know the truth on this subject, is for him to adopt the same course of reasoning in every case, when attempting to ascertain which is the sect that is named in our text. Bring up all these leading features, and compare them with those of any denomination now claiming succession from that old religious body, and I will be satisfied with the result. Whenever you find a religious body, or church, organized upon, and governed by the same creed and church laws, and by them alone, called by the same name, having the same officers, with the same powers—practising the same ordinances, and using the same means for the conversion of sinners—telling the penitent believer to do the same things for remission, and receiving members into the church in the same way that that old party did—you have then found the same sect, the same religious body. Yes, this is the true succession. It is not a succession of ordination, or of ordained ministers, but a succession of faith and practice, that makes the true, holy, apostolic succession.

Should a company of persons, who never saw a Bible or a priest, be shipwrecked, and cast upon some uninhabited island; should they there find a Bible containing both Testaments, and by reading it, they all become firm believers in Christ, the son of God, and the divine Saviour—suppose then, that one of the company baptizes one of the number, and he, in turn, baptizes the rest: suppose, then, that they adopt that holy book, containing the teaching of the apostles and prophets of God, as their only rule of faith and practice; they appoint their bishops and deacons, according to that book, and proceed to keep the ordinances as they were delivered by the apostles: that would be, to all intents and purposes, the same body of people—not the same persons, but the same religious organism. It would be the regular, pure, and holy apostolic church.

Now, I am not going to make the application. My object has been to prepare the reader of this discourse to make the application himself. I have endeavored to develop great, important principles—principles, the truth of which is uncontroverted—hoping that the reader will have interest enough in the subject of church standing to give the subject a careful examination, and honesty of heart, and nobility of soul, sufficient to enable him to act according to the honest convictions of his own mind, enlightened by truth divine, on the great subject of Christianity.

Reader, this is no ordinary subject. The importance of this theme overreaches the cold boundaries of time, and lays hold on things eternal and invisible. Your interests in two worlds depend upon your action in the premises. O, then, be honest with yourself, your conscience, your Bible, your God, and act for eternity while you may.

SERMON IV.

THE NAME.

And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.
Acts xi, 26.

Having spoken, in this series of discourses, on the new church in contrast with the old Jewish kingdom, and having considered that church under the figure of the human body, of which Christ is the head, and having pointed out some of the leading features or distinguishing characteristics of the church of Christ, as a sect that was everywhere spoken against—in doing which, we have laid down some plain rules, by which the true church may always be known, we propose now to speak expressly of the name *Christian*, as the great family name of this religious association. This title was merely referred to in the preceding sermon, but we now propose to make it the subject of a separate discourse.

Without stating any particular order to be observed in this lecture, we proceed to observe,

I. That the term Christian is derived from the term Christ. The term Christ is translated from the Greek word *kristos*, which means anointed. *Ὁ Χριστος*: the Christ, the anointed one. Seeing, then, that the term *Christian* is derived from the term Christ, which means anointed, may not all who wear this name scripturally, or who are scripturally entitled to it, be regarded as the anointed people

of God? Under the old covenant, all the priests were anointed with holy oil. Under the new covenant, all the covenanted people of God are regarded as priests. Peter says: "You are a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ." 2 Peter ii, 9. Then are not these spiritual priests anointed? Their name, *Christian*, indicates that they are. To this holy anointing the apostle John refers, when he says: "You have an unction, [*krisma*, that with which any one is anointed, an anointing], and ye know all things." 1 John ii, 20. See also, verse 27.

Now, there was a very great sacredness attached to anointing, under the Old Testament dispensation. I remember, on one occasion, when Saul was seeking the life of King David, having heard that "David had hid himself in the hill of Hachilah, which is before Jeshimon," that he marched his army of "three thousand chosen men," into the wilderness of Zeph, and pitched his tent "in the hill of Hachilah, which is before Jeshimon." Wearied with the march, he and his army lay down to rest, leaving Abner, his captain, to keep guard; but he also fell into deep sleep.

David, seeing their position and condition, from the hill, took Abishai, and went even unto Saul. There he lay, wrapped up in profound sleep, and there lay his entire army in the same condition. "Then Abishai said to David, God hath delivered thine enemy into thy hand this day; therefore let me smite him, I pray thee, with the spear, even to the earth at once." "And David said to Abishai, Destroy him not, for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless?" They took Saul's spear, and the cruse of water from his head, and left him to enjoy his sleep. Thus, notwithstanding Saul was anointed without a direct warrant from God, and though

he had been pursuing David for a long time, fully bent upon his death, yet even when David had him completely in his power, he would not touch him, just because he had been anointed. Addressing Saul afterward, he said, "The Lord delivered thee into my hand to-day, but I would not stretch forth my hand against the Lord's anointed." 1 Sam. xxvi, 3–23.

This chapter contains a very important lesson, which all would do well to study; but I have merely referred to it to show how sacred this anointing was regarded. Hence God said, "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm." 1 Chron. xvi, 22. Then, if christians are God's anointed ones, as their name teaches, O how sacred are they in his sight! If his ancient people, who were only a type of christians, were to him as dear as the apple of his eye, what must be his tender care for those who are his according to the stipulations of the new and better covenant? Who would not be a christian, in view of this glorious fact?

2. This name is a name of distinction, intended to distinguish those who wear it from all other people. Indeed, this is the only use we have for names. We use proper names for the purpose of distinguishing one person or thing from another person or thing. Doubtless this is the reason why the Lord, in the beginning, permitted our father Adam to give names to all the cattle, and fowls of the air, and beasts of the field. This was done, so that in all coming time, every kind of living creature might be distinguished by name.

Well, the same is true in reference to organized societies. Whether the society be literary, political, or religious, it must have a name, so it may be known when it is spoken to, or spoken of. Now when this new man, or church, was set up, there were very many religious sects

and parties in the world, and each of these had its respective name; hence it was necessary that this church should also have its name. It is also worthy of remark, that ancient names usually expressed some quality, or circumstances connected with the persons or things to which they were applied. Adam means earthly, red; Moses, taken out of the water; Herod, the glory of the skin; Pharisees, separatists, etc. How natural, then, that this new church should be called *christian*, which would not only distinguish it from all other parties then in existence, or that ever should come into being, but that by this significant title, the purity of their hearts and lives might be expressed, and they pointed out as the anointed children of God.

3. The term *christian* is intended to point out those who bear it as the property of Christ. It implies that they are not their own, but that they belong to Christ, being bought with his precious blood. Peter, in giving directions to the elders, says they should not discharge their duties "for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock." 1 Pet. v, 3. In this Scripture, the church is called the heritage of God. The term which is here rendered *heritage*, is *kleeros*, which occurs thirteen times in the New Testament. It is translated in the common version, *lot* eight times, *part* twice, *inheritance* twice, and *heritage* once—namely, in the Scripture just quoted. This word literally means *a lot*. Dr. McKnight, in his note upon this verse, says "the word *κληρος* properly signifies *a lot*. But because the land of Canaan was divided among the Israelites by lot, the word came to signify *an heritage*. Wherefore, believers being God's people, or portion, the different churches, or congregations for worship, are called here God's heritage. In process of time, the name *κληρος*,

clergy, was appropriated to the ministers of the gospel, because, being considered as the successors of the Levitical priests, they were regarded as God's lot, or portion."

Yes, christian reader, that is the way this term became the exclusive title of preachers. At the beginning, it was not so. The Lord's people is his portion, over whom these elders were not to act as lords; for the apostle says, "not as being lords over God's heritage," God's lot, or clergy. Every true and faithful disciple of Christ belongs to the clergy; and hence it is a very presumptuous procedure for any class of men to appropriate this title exclusively to themselves. But I know no one name, ever used as the name of an organized body of people, that points out those to whom it is applied as the people of God, with so little circumlocution as the name christian.

But I fear that all who bear this name, do not always consider this truth as they should. Do you, christian reader, when you call yourself a christian—or when you speak of yourself as belonging to the christian congregation—appreciate the fact that you are not your own—that you are the property of the Lord—and therefore, that you ought to "glorify him in your body and spirit, which are his?"

4. The name christian is a catholic name, intended to swallow up all other ecclesiastical titles. As we have seen, there were many religious parties, when Christ came into our world, and each party had its respective religious cognomen; but the church which Jesus built, was intended to embrace the good of all parties, hence this new, catholic body, should be called by a truly catholic name, which would apply alike to the members of this new body, or church, wherever found. Such is the name *christian*.

When a Jew was baptized into this body, he left his

former name on the other side of the baptismal wave, and arose on the Lord's side of the line that separated them that serve the Lord from them that serve him not, bearing the simple name *christian*. When a Gentile obeyed the gospel, he left his old name behind, and was now known as a *christian*. This great family title swallowed up all others, and designated the people of God without any accompanying, qualifying terms.

Antioch, too, seems to have been the most fitting place to first bestow that name, this being the first christian congregation which was composed of persons from both nations. In Jerusalem, and the regions round about, there were congregations of disciples of Christ, formed exclusively of believing Jews. In Samaria, many of the Samaritans "believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ, and were baptized." At the house of Cornelius, many of the Gentiles embraced the truth, and became the disciples of Christ. Still, they kept up a kind of division between Jew and Gentile. But in Antioch, these two were made visibly one. Here was a congregation formed of members from both nations, and hence it was right, it was appropriate, to give the great family name at this place; and therefore, "*the disciples were called christians first in Antioch.*"

5. My fifth proposition in reference to this important name, is that it is a patronymic name. I mean by this, that it is intended to refer to the founder of the church and the author of our holy religion. A patronymic name simply means "a name of men or women, derived from that of their parents or ancestors," (Webster). But the names of states, kingdoms, cities, societies, or churches, derived from the founders of these organisms, are also patronymics. Pennsylvania is a patronymic name, and refers to William Penn, the honest old Quaker from whom the State was

named; Washington, when applied to the capital of the United States, is a patronymic name, referring to that celebrated chieftain who is so justly styled the Father of his Country. So, the name Lutheran is a patronymic name, derived from the great reformer, Martin Luther, who is regarded as the founder of that religious denomination that is called by that name. Wesleyan is another name of the same sort.

So, the name *Christian* is a patronymic name, derived from Christ, the builder of the church, (see Matt. xvi, 18), and the author of the religion of the New Testament. All such names have a commemorative influence. As long as towns and cities are called *Washington*, the name of that great man will never be forgotten; as long as there is a religious denomination called *Lutherans*, so long will the name of that mighty reformer be handed down to posterity. Should all the records of the sayings and doings of Martin Luther be buried in oblivion, yet would his name be repeated and remembered every time the name of that church is called; and those who wear the name would still talk to each other and to their children of the deeds of the reformer; and thus he would still be remembered by his followers.

So, the name *Christian* carries the name of Christ in its own bosom, and as long as there is a people on earth called by that name, the author and finisher of the christian's system of faith can never be forgotten.

This can not be said of any other *church name* known to me. The name Episcopalian would remind one of bishops; the name Presbyterian would remind one of aged persons, or elders, as officials in the church; the name Methodist would suggest the idea of a body of persons who work by method; but not one of these ever directs the thoughts to Christ, the Son of the living God. And

even the scriptural names—brethren, saints, disciples—without some adjunct, would not do it. These are scriptural terms, and no disciple of Christ should be ashamed to wear them; but still, the pronunciation of them does not so directly lift the thoughts to Christ, as the simple appellative, *Christian*. No wonder that the apostle should say, "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on this account." 1 Pet. iv, 16.

6. This name *Christian* seems to have been given by divine authority. This is my sixth proposition in reference to this consecrated name.

This seems to be reasonable. If Christ built the church; if he gave its constitution, and laws, and ordinances—if he is the head of the church—is it not reasonable that he should name it?

I will here introduce some remarks of the very learned Dr. A. Clark, upon this subject. As he was a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he can not be supposed to have any sectarian or traditionary partialities for this name. In his notes upon Acts xi, 26, he says: "The word *chreematisai*, in our common text, which we translate *were called*, signifies, in the New Testament, to appoint, warn, or nominate, by *divine* direction. In this sense, the word is used, Matt. ii, 12; Luke ii, 26; and in Acts x, 22. If, therefore, the name was given by divine appointment, it is most likely that Paul and Barnabas were directed to give it, and that, therefore, the name Christian is from God, as well as that grace and holiness which are essentially required and implied in the character. Before this time, the Jewish converts were simply called, among themselves, *disciples*, i. e., scholars; *believers*, *saints*, *the church*, or *assembly*; and by their enemies, *Nazarenes*, *Galileans*, *the men of this way*, or *sect*; and perhaps by other names which are not come down to us. They considered themselves as

one family, and hence the appellation of *brethren* was frequent among them. It was the design of God to make all who believed, of *one heart* and *one soul*, that they might consider him as their Father, and live and love like children of the same household. A *Christian*, therefore, is the highest character which any human being can bear upon earth ; and to receive it from God, as these seem to have done, how glorious the title!"

Again, the Doctor says in his general remarks at the end of the chapter: "It appears that CHRISTIAN was the first *general* appellation of the followers of the blessed Lord, and there is presumptive evidence, as we have seen, that this appellative came by *divine appointment*. How very few of those who profess this religion are satisfied with this title. That very church that arrogates *all* to itself, has totally abandoned this title, and its members call themselves *Roman Catholic*, which is absurd; because the *adjective* and substantive include *opposite* ideas: *catholic* signifies *universal*, and *Roman* signifies *belonging to Rome*. If it be merely *Roman*, it can not be *catholic*—if it be catholic, it can not be confined to Rome: but it is not catholic or universal, in any sense of the word, for it contains but a small part of the people who profess christianity. The term *protestant* has more common sense in it, but not much more piety. Almost all sects and parties proceed in the same line; but *Christian* is a title seldom heard of, and the spirit and practice of Christianity but rarely occur. When all return to the spirit of the gospel, they will probably resume the appellative of *Christian*."

I have introduced this long quotation from Dr. Clark, for three purposes:

1. To show to the reader of this discourse, the reasons which the Doctor had for thinking that the name *Christian* was given by divine authority, and thus to place this great

and good man in favor of the proposition now under consideration.

2. To present his views of the cause which led to an abandonment of this *name* as a church name, and the adoption of other, sectarian, and unauthorized titles. He says, "When all return to the spirit of the gospel, they will probably resume the appellative *Christian.*" This shows that this name was dispensed with by a departure from the spirit of the gospel. This is the unvarnished truth in the case. The Doctor's criticism on the name *Roman Catholic* is very just, *and true*, and forcible; but, with the same skill and learning which he employed, many other church names might be shown to be as inconsistent. There is the name *Protestant Episcopal* church. The Dr. admits that the name *Protestant* has not much more piety in it than the name *Roman Catholic.* But take the entire name, and what does it mean? Protestant means "one of the party who adhered to Luther, at the Reformation in 1529, and protested against a decree of Emperor Charles V. and the Diet of Spires; and appealed to a general council," (Webster). Episcopal is translated from *episkopos*, which means overseer; church is from *ekklesia*, which means assembly, congregation. Then *Protestant Episcopal Church* would signify a congregation of overseers protesting against a decree of Charles V! *Methodist Episcopal Church* would mean a congregation of overseers, all acting by method. *Baptist Church* means a congregation of baptizers. How much more does either of the above examples accord with truth and consistency, than the name *Roman Catholic?*

3. But my third object in introducing the Dr.'s testimony, was to show his views of the use that will likely be made of the name *Christian*, "*when all return to the spirit of the gospel.*" From what he says, he must have believed in a time to come, when all true believers in Christ will

return to the spirit of the gospel; and that when that time comes, all these party names will be laid aside, and the followers of the blessed Saviour will be simply called *Christians*. And O, who does not long to see such a time? Then, as at the beginning, if any man shall say, I am a Christian, all will know his religious position. It will not have to be asked, What church do you belong to? The name Christian will show.

It may not be improper to notice the two passages of scripture referred to by Dr. Clark, to illustrate or confirm the meaning which he has attached to the Greek word *Χρηματισαι*. These are, Matt. ii, 12; Luke ii, 26; Acts x, 22. In the first, the name of God is not found in the original—the whole phrase, *warned of God*, is translated from the simple word *kreematizo*. The same is true in reference to Acts x, 22. The word is rendered *revealed*, in Luke ii, 26, and the Holy Spirit is named as the agent by whom the revelation was made; but an admonition made by the Holy Spirit is of the same divine authority as if made by the Heavenly Father himself. These examples show very clearly that the king's translators understood this term *kreematizo* to signify, as Greenfield has defined it, "in the New Testament, to impart a divine warning, or admonition, give instructions or directions under the guidance of inspiration."

This word occurs nine times in the New Testament, and is translated, in the common version, *warned of*, or *from*, *God*, four times; *revealed*, once; *called*, twice; *that spake*, once; and *admonished*, once. In all these occurrences of the word, there are but two that admit of any doubt as to the fact that the warning, revealing, or speaking came by divine authority. These are Rom. vii, 3, and Acts xi, 26. In Rom. vii, 3, "she *shall be called* an adulteress," surely means more than that she shall be so styled by her enemies,

or by the people; it signifies that she shall be so called *by the will of God.* So I think in our text it means that the disciples *were called Christians* by the divine authority which Paul and Barnabas received from God.

In further proof of the proposition that the name *Christian* is of divine origin, we will compare Amos ix, 12, with Acts xv, 16, 17. The former reads thus: "At that day, I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen down, and close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen which are called by my name." The latter reads: "After this, I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and will set it up; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

1. My first remark upon these scriptures is, that whatever is done, or is to be done, in fulfillment of them, is the work of the Lord, for it is here declared that "*the Lord doeth all these things.*"

2. The apostles understood Amos ix, 12, to apply to the Christian church in the gospel dispensation. At the time the apostle James made this quotation, the apostles and elders of the church at Jerusalem were sitting in solemn council, deliberating on one of the most important questions that had ever disturbed the church of God. That question was: May the Gentiles become Christians, and be saved, without being circumcised—without becoming Jews by proselytism? In order to prove that the Gentiles may be saved without being circumcised, and keeping the law of Moses, James quotes Amos ix, 12. The heathen, in Amos, and the Gentiles, in Acts, mean the same people.

Now, if James had not understood the prophecy of Amos to apply to the church of Christ in the gospel day, he could not have used this scripture in defense of his position. And had the other apostles believed that this prophecy had a literal meaning, and is to be fulfilled at some far-distant day, they surely would have made their objection to James' application of it. But we hear of no such objection, hence we must conclude that they were all of one mind upon this subject.

3. We see that, according to this prophecy, the Lord's people were to be called by his name, in the gospel dispensation. To be "*called by my name,*" as in Amos, and "*upon whom my name is called,*" as in Acts, mean the same thing.

Now, I ask, how is it that the Lord's people were to be called by his name? Are they so called now? Or, have they ever been? What is meant by being called by His name?

In answer to this question, and in further illustration of the position now assumed, I will here introduce a quotation from the learned and pious B. W. Stone, who now rests in Paradise:

"The Greek verb *epikaleomai* is both in the passive and middle voice, and signifies both passive and active. In the New Testament, when its passive voice occurs, it uniformly signifies *surnamed*, or *called*—when its middle voice occurs, it as uniformly signifies to invoke, call upon, or appeal to.

"I will bring to view the texts in the New Testament where the passive of this verb is used, and commonly translated *surnamed*. Matt. x, 3: 'And Lebbeus, whose *surname* was Thaddeus.' Luke xx, 3: 'Then entered Satan into Judas, *surnamed* Iscariot.' Acts i, 23: 'And they appointed two, Joses called Barsabas, who was *surnamed*

Justus.' Acts iv, 36: 'And Joses, who by the apostles was *surnamed* Barnabas.' Acts x, 5: 'And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose *surname* is Peter.' The same phrase occurs in the 18th and 32d verses, and also in chap. xi, 13. Acts xii, 12: 'He came to the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose *surname* was Mark.' The same occurs in the 25th verse. Acts xv, 22: 'Judas, *surnamed* Barsabas.' James says (ii, 7): 'Do they not blaspheme that worthy name by which ye are called?' or *surnamed*, for it is the same word." Undoubtedly, this name blasphemed was *Christ*, or *Christians*. Now, reader, notice. "The prophet Amos says (ix, 12): 'And of all the heathen which are called by my name.' James quotes this passage in Acts xv, 17, thus: 'And all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called.' This demonstrably proves that the phrase *to be called by my name* is the same as *upon whom my name is called*.

"This phraseology is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, and signifies there, surnames, attached to their proper names. Israel was one of those names; for in this name is *El*, the Hebrew name for God. This was the name given by the Lord to Jacob, and by this name were all his children called—the children of Israel. Thus, the phrase, The Gentiles who are called by thy name, or, On whom thy name is called, is the same as that 'by which ye are called,' or *surnamed*, which all must agree to be Christian, after Christ."—[*Chr. Mess.*, *vol.* 14, *pp.* 161, 162.

Then to be called by the Lord's name, according to Amos ix, 12, is to be called *Christian*. To make this matter more plain, read Dan. ix, 19: "O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God, for thy city and thy people are called by thy name." Now, on what other principle was this true, except

the one that was named above. *El*, one of the Hebrew names for God, is incorporated in the word Israel; hence, whenever the name Israel was pronounced, the name of God was pronounced. When God gave Jacob this name, he placed his own name upon him. Well, then, might the prophet say: "*Thy people are called by thy name.*"

So, the name of Christ is embosomed in the name *Christian;* and hence, whenever that name is pronounced, the name of Christ is spoken. Surely the apostle had reference to this fact when he said: "If you be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are you." 1 Pet. iv, 14. According to this same apostle, to suffer as a *Christian*, and to suffer for the name of Christ, is the same thing. He says, if ye are reproached for the name of Christ, you are happy. "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer, or as a busy-body in other men's matters; yet, if any man suffer as a *Christian*, let him not be ashamed." Thus are the phrases "*for the name of Christ*," and "*as a Christian*," used interchangeably, as both meaning the same thing.

The same fact is referred to by the apostle, when he says: "Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seat? Do they not blaspheme that worthy name by the which you are called?" James ii, 6, 7. This worthy name was surely the name of Christ or Christian, by which they were called. How appropriate, then, was the response of the king, when he had heard the arguments of Paul in favor of Christianity: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Acts xxvi, 28. The king was almost persuaded to receive the Christian faith, adopt the Christian's course of life, and take upon him that worthy name by which the disciples of Christ were called. But, alas, he was only *almost* persuaded. And how many go this far, and yet die in their sins!

The prophet Isaiah, fired with the spirit of inspiration, looked forward to the gospel day, and said: "You shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen, for the Lord shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name." And again: "Thou shalt be called by a new name which the mouth of the Lord shall name." Isaiah lxv, 15; lxii, 2. Now, I ask, what is this new name? Dr. Clark says this new name is Christian. If he is correct, then the name Christian is given by the mouth of the Lord.

If this new name is not *Christian*, then this prophecy has never been fulfilled; for this is the only *new name* by which the people of God were called in the New Testament. They are called saints, because of the purity of their hearts and lives, but this is an Old Testament name. They were called brethren, but this is no new name. David said: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for *brethren* to dwell together in unity." Ps. cxxxiii, 1. They were called disciples, but this name was known to the Old Testament saints, and was also applied to students of the different schools of philosophy. Indeed, I remember no new name by which the followers of the Lord were called, save the name Christian. It was a NEW NAME, emphatically; a name unknown to Jew or Gentile until Paul and Barnabas had assembled with the church at Antioch a whole year, and had taught much people. Then it was, while these divinely authorized teachers were fully instructing the people in the holy will of God, that the disciples were called Christians *first*. Then was fulfilled the word of the Lord, which saith: "YOU SHALL BE CALLED BY A NEW NAME, WHICH THE MOUTH OF THE LORD SHALL NAME."

I will now proceed to answer some objections to making this the name of the church, and to considering it a name of divine origin.

1. It may be objected, that if it can be proven that this

name came by divine direction, as the surname, or family name, of the Lord's people, then we should discontinue every other New Testament name. But I can not see why this should be so. The Lord changed the name of Jacob to Israel, but he was often called Jacob after that, and even his descendants were called Jacob, as a national title. "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance," (Deut. xxxii, 9), was said near three hundred years after Jacob's name was changed to Israel by divine authority. Why, then, may not the followers of Christ answer to any name that was acknowledged by the disciples of Christ in the days of the apostles, and still regard the name *Christian* as the great family name which the mouth of the Lord hath named? Paul addressed the members of the church as saints, the servants of God, the beloved brethren, and yet he said: "I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Eph. iii, 14, 15. This must mean that the family was named *Christian*, after Christ.

2. But it is said by those who wish to justify themselves in wearing other and unscriptural names, the name Christian was given to the disciples of Christ by their enemies, as a name of reproach.

Now, I can not see any reason for such a conclusion. They were called by some names by their enemies out of contempt, but we never read of any apostle or disciple acknowledging these names. Can you suppose, dear reader, that if the apostle Peter had known that this name came from the enemies of the cause of Christ, he would have left it on record for the comfort of the Lord's people to the end of time: "If any man suffer as Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on that behalf," or account? Why did he not say, If any man suffer as a Nazarene? Because he would not give countenance to

a name which had been hurled at him and his brethren out of contempt.

When King Agrippa said to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," would the apostle have given countenance to that name, as he did, had he known that it originated in the dark, black hearts of the children of the wicked one? Suppose some of our brethren should be preaching to a congregation, and while urging the holy claims of Christianity upon his audience, one should arise and say: "Well, sir, you have almost persuaded me to be a Campbellite," would he be likely to reply: "I would to God that you, and all who hear me to-day, were not only almost, but altogether, such as I am"? By no means. If he thought the man sincere, but ignorant of the right way of the Lord, he would be likely to say: "My dear friend, I am not trying to make Campbellites; I only desire for you to become a Christian."

There is a sect of Methodists in England, who, on account of their religious exercises, are called Ranters. Now, suppose, at the close of a sermon, delivered by one of the preachers of that party, some one should speak out in the crowd, and say: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Ranter," what do you think the preacher would say? Surely, he would not acknowledge the name Ranter on such a solemn occasion as this. No, nor would Paul, standing before the king's court, not knowing but he was making his last public address on the subject of salvation through the blood of Christ, with legal chains upon his emaciated person, and all the sanctions of his apostolic office resting upon his conscience, have even appeared to sanction a name which had been hurled at the church of God by the bitter opposers of the blessed Jesus. But he did acknowledge the name *Christian*, by saying, "Would to God that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and

altogether such as I am, except these bonds." Acts xxvi, 29.

3. But this name is objected to, as a church name, because it is too exclusive. For a church to call itself the *Christian Church*, they say, seems to imply that none other are Christian; it is appropriating a name, which of right belongs to all the people of God, to one individual party of the disciples of Christ.

But, if there is anything wrong in this, I ask, at whose door does the sin lie? At the door of those who are endeavoring to return to the *old paths*—that are laboring to bring the church of God to apostolic ground in all things? or does it lie at the door of those who have departed from the primitive order of things, and have assumed human names by which to distinguish themselves? Surely, if there is any sin in the case, those who have taken names which God has not authorized must account to the Judge of the living and the dead for that sin.

It must be admitted by all, that there was a time when this name was not too exclusive. It was not too exclusive when Peter said: "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on that account." And had the church remained pure, or, according to Dr. Clark, had she not departed from the spirit of the gospel, this name would not be too exclusive now.

I am willing to admit that it would be wrong for a body of people, organized upon a constitution, or confession of faith, of human origin, and governed by laws of their own enacting, to call themselves the *Christian church*. They may—nay, they should—adopt a name corresponding with the nature of their organism; but I doubt the propriety of their claiming to be the church of Christ, after they have thus organized.

When we repudiate all unscriptural titles, and adopt the names by which the first followers of Christ were called, we do it from principle. Beholding the awful ravages which sectarianism has made upon our holy religion—the army of the Lord's hosts being thus weakened—while the prince of darkness is mustering his combined forces against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, "Let us break their bonds asunder, and cast their cords from us;" and while infidels and skeptics were laughing at the divisions among the Lord's people, we began to inquire for the cause. It was soon discovered that party spirit had originated party creeds, and party organizations upon those creeds had given birth to party names, and that these things were standing directly in the way of the success of the gospel and the salvation of sinners.

We therefore resolved to clear ourselves of the responsibility resting upon those who caused or kept up this state of things. But how was this to be done? Shall we form a more liberal creed than any now in existence, and try to bring all to that? We could not hope to do that. But should we bring many of the more liberal minded to unite with us on such a creed, we would only have made one more sect, and those who remained upon their old party platforms would justly charge us with presumption, for asking them to unite with us, while they had just as good a right to make a creed, and originate a party, as we had. And then we feared to meet the awful question in the last day: *Who hath required this at your hands?* We therefore resolved to take our stand on the Bible alone—determined to reject everything in Christianity for which we could find no precept or precedent in the teaching of the apostles of the Lamb.

Now, no one will say that this was wrong; for to say so,

would be to say that the church of Christ, under the immediate inspection, direction, and supervision of the holy apostles, commenced its career in error!

Then, if the principle upon which we set out was right, what could we do but adopt scriptural names? When we adopt the name *Christian* as the family name of God's people, we mean no disrespect for any body of people on earth; we do not do it for the purpose of exalting ourselves, or abasing others; we are driven to it by the holy principles which we have adopted. We do it, therefore, from principle, and to exalt Him by whom are all things, and for whom are all things.

4. It is sometimes urged as an objection to this name, that it is too assuming; it is taking too high ground. But, I ask, was it taking too high ground for the disciples to be called Christians first at Antioch? If it was not too assuming then, it ought not to be so considered now.

5. But it is objected that the church is not worthy of so sacred a title. I once heard of a good old Baptist brother saying, when the subject of changing the name Baptist for the name Christian was under discussion: "I am opposed to the change. Now, that I am a Baptist, I know; but whether I am a Christian, admits of serious doubts—and hence, I am opposed to taking that name as a church title." And I fear that many who profess to have taken the scriptures of divine truth as their only directory in all things pertaining to Christianity, sometimes feel the same embarrassment. How often they seem to blush, and hesitate, when asked what church they belong to. Some will say Reformers, or something else, rather than come square out, and say, I profess to be a Christian—I am a member of the church of God.

But, suppose we admit that none of the ecclesiastical organizations are worthy of this name, and that we, after

all our efforts to restore primitive Christianity to the church, or to restore the church to primitive Christianity, have not yet arrived to a point in scriptural order and scriptural holiness that would justify us in taking this sacred name, what shall we then do? Shall we remain where we are, and take to ourselves some name more in accordance with our low state of morals? Or, would it not be better to hold on to the name, and try to bring the church up to a point in Christian perfection where she might consistently wear the name? This certainly would be the better course. Whenever a person professing Christianity says that he is not worthy of the name, I would advise him to do one of two things at once: either *reform* or *renounce*. Reform in spirit and manners until he could wear the name without blushing, or renounce the profession altogether. But, for the Lord's sake, and for his own soul's sake, I would advise the former.

But it may be said, after all, that names are small matters—that it makes no difference by what name we are called, so the heart is right—that, therefore, though we are right in wearing the name *Christian*, still they are not wrong in adopting other names.

But, my dear reader, do you suppose that Christ has no regard for the name by which his people shall be called? If the Lord built the church, and gave it all its laws and ordinances, as clearly shown in the first discourse in this book—if he is the head of the church—if he loved the church, and gave himself for it—if he sympathizes with the church so much as to regard an act done to the church as done to himself, as shown in our second discourse—I say, if all these things are so, he must have a will in reference to the name by which his people shall be called. He watches over the church with a kind but jealous eye. He will not allow his glory to be given to another.

If it is an honor to a man to have towns, cities, and organized societies called for him, is it not still more honor to have churches called for us? Should a portion of the members of the Lord's body organize themselves into a party, and take to themselves the name of some good and great man, would not this be giving a portion of the glory that belongs to Christ, to another person? Can we do this, and be guiltless?

But I will leave this investigation with the reader, after propounding one question, which I desire every one who may read this discourse to ponder well, in the light of sound reason and of revelation. Here it is:

CAN ANY THING BE RELIGIOUSLY RIGHT, AND SCRIPTURALLY WRONG, AT THE SAME TIME? CAN ANY CHURCH NAME BE RELIGIOUSLY RIGHT WHEN IT IS UNAUTHORIZED BY THE WORD OF GOD?

Remember, reader, the name of the church is a religious matter, and should be governed by the Holy Scriptures, as long as we hold the great truth, that the Bible is higher in authority than the church.

I will now close this discourse with a few words of advice to those who stand upon the Bible, and who wear the Christian name.

Dear brethren, you stand on holy ground. Our religious neighbors are correct, when they say that we have taken high ground; that we have assumed an elevated position in the religious world. O, then, let us show by our daily walk and conversation, that we are sincere. Let us give the enemy no reason to speak reproachfully of us, but let our behavior be such "that they who are of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil to say of us." Never be ashamed of the holy name by which you are called.

It was spoken to the praise of the church at Philadelphia, that they had not denied the Lord's name. (See Rev.

iii, 8). Yes, notwithstanding the corruption of those times, and the persecutions to which the church was exposed—under which all the seven churches in Asia had erred, more or less, save this one congregation—the Lord said to this church, "Thou hast a little strength, and *hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name.*" They still kept the word of God as their rule of faith and practice, and therefore wore the name of Christ—the name Christian—and for this they received the approval of the great head of the church.

My brethren, if this name implies that we are the anointed of the Lord, anointed priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God through our Lord Jesus Christ; if this name is intended to distinguish the people of God from all other persons; if this name is intended to point out those who wear it, as the Lord's property, the Lord's lot, the Lord's inheritance; if it is a catholic name, intended to bury and swallow up all party names in religion; if it is a patronymic name, referring to Christ, the author of our holy religion and the founder of the church; if the name Christian was given by divine authority, of which there is very strong evidence: I say, if all these things are so, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation?

When Moses approached the burning bush — which burned, but was not consumed—the Lord said unto him: "Put off thy shoes, for the place where thou standest is holy ground." Ex. iii, 5. And do not we stand on holy ground? Most assuredly we do; and should we not then put off all unrighteousness, and all filthiness of flesh and spirit, and practice holiness in the fear of God?

Brethren, this reformation in which we are engaged, has not done its work until the people of God who occupy Bible ground in theory, have become so upright, so pious, so

devout, so heavenly-minded, that all who revere the Bible will be constrained to say, These people are not only Christians in name, but they are Christians in deed and in truth. Brethren, with the proper effort, made according to the word of God, and with his divine assistance, this may be done.

May the great head of the church help us all to do his will, and make this discourse a blessing to all who may read it, is my sincere prayer. Amen.

SERMON V.

CONVERSION.

For this people's heart is waxed gross; and their ears are dull of hearing; and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. Matt. xiii, 15.

I HAVE chosen, as the theme of the present discourse, the doctrine of conversion, which is plainly mentioned in the above text: "That they might be *converted*, and I should heal them." The doctrine of conversion to God, is an infinitely important doctrine to every child of Adam who has come to the years of accountability. Its interests extend to the third heaven, and lay hold on things invisible and eternal. With what deep feelings of anxiety, then, should we approach this awfully grand and transcendantly glorious theme. But before entering upon the subject proper, I will premise a few things.

1. The first word in the text, upon which we will make a remark, is the term *healed*. What are we to understand by being healed? Mark, speaking upon this same subject, says, "That they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them." Mark iv, 12. Then Matthew and Mark use the terms *healed* and *forgiven*, as convertible terms. To be healed according to Matthew, is to be forgiven according to Mark.

All who are living in their sins, unforgiven, and

irreconciled to God, are represented in the Scriptures as laboring under a moral malady, which has fastened itself upon their moral constitution, and is working to bring forth fruit unto death. Jesus is represented in the gospel, standing with open arms, possessed of all the *materia medica* of heaven, and crying to a sin-sick world, in the soothing language of the Bible, "WILT THOU BE MADE WHOLE?" And all who apply to this great physician of souls, and comply with his holy prescriptions, obtain a plenary remission of all their past transgressions against God's moral government.

2. The next suggestion that I will make, is that *conversion* and *pardon* are not the same. Public speakers on the subject of Christianity, sometimes confound things that God never intended to be united. Hence, conversion, a change of heart, remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, are often spoken of as so many different expressions, all expressive of the same fact. This is not correct. Conversion is one thing, remission is another, and the gift of the Holy Spirit is still another thing. These are all different items in the great process of salvation. Hence the Saviour says, "that they might be *converted*, and I should *heal* or *pardon* them;" thus representing conversion and pardon as two distinct items in the system of human salvation.

3. I suggest thirdly, that, in the order of time, conversion goes before pardon. Christ did not say, that they might be healed, and I should convert them; but that they might be *converted*, and I should *heal* them; thus placing conversion before being healed, or pardoned.

4. Once more. According to the language of the text, conversion not only goes before pardon, but pardon depends upon conversion; no conversion, no pardon. The text

reads, "that they might be converted, and I should heal them," thus plainly making pardon depend upon conversion.

Now, all these things being so, how important is it that we understand what is meant by being converted. For, if I do not understand what conversion is, I do not know whether I am converted, or not; and if I do not know whether or not I am converted, I do not know whether or not I am pardoned. My object, then, in this discourse, is to endeavor to place before the reader the whole doctrine of evangelical conversion, in all its length and breadth, and depth and hight, in a plain and scriptural manner, so that all who read may understand all that the Scriptures mean, when speaking on this sublime subject.

The simple term *convert* means to change. Webster defines the word thus: "To change, or turn into another substance or form. 2. To change from one state to another. 3. To change or turn from one religion, or from one party or sect, to another. 4. To turn from a bad life to a good one; to change the heart and moral character from enmity to God, and from vicious habits, to love of God, and to a holy life," etc.—all of which is embraced in the simple word *change*, though it may be applied to different objects. This book was once separate sheets of paper, but the paper has been converted into a book. The paper was once a bundle of rags; but these old and apparently worthless rags, were converted into paper, and then the paper, by a second conversion, was turned into a book.

Now, when this word conversion is used in a religious sense, it does not lose its primary signification; it still means a change.

That we may speak on this subject with some degree of order and system, we propose to notice—

I. The change of heart that is contemplated in gospel conversion.

II. The change of life, or character, which the Bible teaches, as implied in conversion.

III. The change of state, or relation, which the gospel requires to complete the conversion of a sinner to God.

From this programme, it will be perceived at once, that evangelical conversion is no partial work; but that it is designed to be a conversion of the whole man—soul, body, spirit and life—to the living God.

I. Let us then consider the change of heart contemplated in this glorious work. That the Bible does teach the doctrine of a change of heart, must be admitted by all. The phrase *a change of heart* may not be in the Bible, just in so many words, but the idea that we all wish to convey by this phrase, floats on the very surface of revelation.

I know that some persons have the notion that we, as a people, deny the doctrine of a change of heart; that we deny the idea of *heartfelt* religion. It is sometimes said that we have a kind of head religion, that floats in the ærial regions of the brain, and never gets down to the heart. Hence the remark is sometimes reproachfully made, that if our head were taken off, our religion would be gone. How this idea originated, or by whom it was first published, I know not, nor do I ever expect to know. One thing I do know, and that is, that it never started inside of our Zion.

No, gentle reader, no man who believes in the Bible can deny that Christianity has much to do with the heart. Indeed, the Bible says much about the hearts of the children of men. It says "the *heart* is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" Jer. xvii, 9. Again: "Because sentence against an evil work is

not executed speedily, therefore the *hearts* of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil." Ecc. viii, 11. Jesus said, "A good man out of the good treasure of his *heart* bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure of his *heart*, bringeth forth that which is evil; for of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Luke vi, 45. And the apostle Paul, addressing those who were in the practice of judging others, while they themselves remained in sin, said: "Thou, after thy hardness and impenitent *heart*, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." Rom. ii, 5. And Christ said, "Blessed are the pure in *heart*." Matt. v, 8.

Thus we have wicked hearts, deceitful hearts, hearts fully set on doing evil, hard and impenitent hearts, good hearts, and pure hearts, all spoken of in the scriptures of truth. Indeed, the heart is contemplated as the great *work-shop*, in which all our actions are coined before they are carried out in real practice; for, from what is in the heart, the mouth speaks.

Now, the man whose heart is hard and impenitent will not obey God. Under the dictates and promptings of this hard and impenitent heart, he will continue a course of rebellion against God, adding iniquity to crime, and will thus treasure up to himself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the just judgments of God. Then, in order to this man's salvation, his heart must be converted, must be changed. From a hard, unfeeling, unrelenting heart, it must be changed to a feeling, contrite, penitent heart.

But, after we have said this much about the heart, do we understand ourselves? When the preacher tells the sinner that he must obtain a change of heart, does the sinner know

what he means? Ah, does the preacher know? Reader, do we know what the Bible means when it says so much about the hearts of the children of men?

I will here introduce a few scriptures and scripture examples which will place this subject in a clear light before the mind of the reader. In the 15th chapter of 2d Samuel, it is said that "Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel." Now, what are we to understand from this? Not that he stole their literal hearts. Indeed, I suppose no one understands the Bible to speak of this little muscle of flesh, through which the fluid of life passes, when the human heart is mentioned. All have a more exalted notion of the heart than this.

By reading the whole connection in the above scripture, it will be seen that Absalom, on the occasion referred to, expressed great concern for the welfare of the men of Israel. He "stood by the side of the way of the gate; and it was so, that when any man that had a controversy came to the king for judgment, then Absalom called unto him, and said, Of what city art thou? And he said, Thy servant is of one of the tribes of Israel. And Absalom said unto him, See, thy matters are good and right; but there is no man deputed of the king to hear thee. Absalom said also, O, that I were made judge in the land, that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me, and I would do him justice! And it was so, that when any man came nigh unto him to do him obeisance, he put forth his hand, and took him, and kissed him. *So Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel.*"

From all this, it is clear, that by the heart, the affections of the mind are meant. Absalom, by these acts of kindness, and strong expressions of regard for the *dear people*, gained their affections; and when this was done, the Bible says, he stole their hearts.

Take another example. Solomon says: "The heart of fools is in the house of mirth." In this example, the wise man supposes a case in which a number of young persons have gathered themselves together to spend a jovial evening. All is vanity and mirth. This simpleton knows that such a scene of mirth exists, but he is not present, but his heart is there; he is absent in body, but present in heart. Now, what is meant by it? All say, without a dissenting voice, that in this case the heart means the affections of the mind. All the affections and desires of that poor simpleton gather around that mirthful group, and he longs to be there.

But, says Solomon, "the heart of the wise is in the house of mourning." Ecc. vii, 4. This wise man knows of a scene of mourning in the neighborhood. Perhaps the hand of death has been laid upon the head of the family, and all are immersed in gloom and mourning. There are heard the deep sigh and mournful groans of the dear bereaved members of a distressed family. This wise man is not there, but he knows the facts, and his heart is there. Now, what is meant by this? His body is in one place, and his heart in another. There is no difficulty in understanding this. All say it means that his affections are there. All the affections and tender sympathies of his mind cluster around that mourning, sorrowful group. Here, then, the heart means the affections and sympathies of the mind.

In the very last chapter of the Old Testament, the Lord says, by his prophet, "Behold, I will send you Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. And he shall turn the *hearts* of the father to the children, and the *hearts* of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." Now, what is meant by the heart in this scripture? All say it means the affections; that this great reformer was to unite the

fathers and children in affection, and thus avert a judgment which was hanging over that wicked nation on account of a want of parental affection on the one hand, and filial love on the other.

Let us now take one example from the New Testament. Jesus said to his disciples: "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where your treasure is, there will your *heart* be also." Matt. vi, 20, 21.

From this expression, it seems that it is possible for a man, while he is here upon earth, attending to the busy scenes of life, to have his heart high up in heaven. How are we to understand this? Let the apostle Paul explain: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. *Set your affections* on things above, not on things on the earth." Col. iii, 1, 2. Thus, Paul explains the heart to mean the affections of the mind. When a man has his affections placed on his eternal inheritance which is laid up in heaven, Jesus says that his heart is in heaven.

The term heart is also used in the scriptures to express the judgment or understanding. Paul says: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe *in thy heart* that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for, with the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. x, 9, 10. Here the heart means the understanding. John says: "If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our *heart*, and knoweth all things." 1 John iii, 20. Here the *heart* means the judgment. If our own judgments, enlightened by the word of God, condemn us, we may expect to be condemned by Him who knoweth all things.

Now, from all these scripture examples, we are prepared to understand what is meant by a change of heart. Where a man's judgment is perverted, and his affections are all set on sinful objects and wicked pursuits, it is said that "his heart is fully set in him to do evil." Where his affections are unmoved by the goodness of God, it is said that his heart is "hard and impenitent." And just as long as his judgment, affections and sympathies remain in this state, he will continue to rebel against God, and thus will he "treasure up to himself wrath against the day of wrath, and the revelation of the righteous judgments of God."

But, in gospel conversion, a change in his judgment and in all the affections and desires of the mind is contemplated. Old faculties are not to be destroyed, and new ones imparted. The man loved and hated before he was converted, and he loves and hates after he is converted. And the same faculties are employed in both cases. But these affections are turned in a different direction. He can now say from the heart, the things which I once loved I now hate, and the things which I once hated I now love. And this is no small matter. For a man to have his judgment corrected, and all his desires and affections thus turned to God, and set on heavenly and divine objects, is of infinite importance, and therefore should be earnestly sought by every child of man.

II. Let us now consider the change of character and life that is contemplated in gospel conversion. That such a change is taught in the Holy Scriptures, all who have studied the Bible with any degree of attention must know. The Lord said to Israel, when in a state of great apostasy, "Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well." Isaiah i, 16. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will

have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Isaiah lv, 7. This implies an entire change of life, or practice; and, as a man's character is made up of his practice it also implies a change of character.

This same change is abundantly taught in the New Testament. The apostle Peter says to the man that would love life and enjoy good days, "let him eschew or turn away from evil, and do good." 1 Pet. iii, 11. Wherever it is said that a person believed and *turned to* the Lord, this conversion of life is meant. Indeed this is the leading idea in the doctrine of evangelical repentance. The repentance of the gospel means more than to be sorry for sin. It also means to turn away from sin. Hence, Paul says: "A godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation." 2 Cor. vii, 10. The word that is here translated repentance is *metanoian*, which Greenfield defines thus: "repentance, *i. e.* a change of mind and purpose; a change of one's mode of thinking, feeling and acting; reformation of life."

Now, we often speak of a man who is thus converted, as being a different man. See that man who has long been in the practice of cursing and swearing—indulging in drunkenness and all its kindred crimes. He repents of his sins, and becomes a pious, upright and temperate man. Everybody says, "What a different man he is." He has become a new man. Now, we do not mean that he is physically different, though there may even be some change in his physical appearance. But this is not what we mean. We mean that he is a different man in character—that his life and practice is changed. Well, this change is always implied in the conversion taught in the gospel; it is a part of the great work referred to in our text: "*that they might be converted and I should heal them.*" And let no one suppose that he can ever obtain the pardoning love of God

without such a change; for David said: "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." Ps. lxvi. 18. And I care not what professions a man may make about his heart being changed, no one who understands the Bible has any confidence in his professions, unless there is a corresponding change of life, of character, of practice.

III. But all that we have now considered may be effected, and still the work of conversion is incomplete. All that the scriptures teach on the great subject of conversion, has not yet been accomplished. The Bible teaches a conversion of state, or relation, which we now proceed to consider. That such a conversion is taught, and even commanded in the word of God, can not be denied. The apostle, speaking for the Lord, said: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean, and I will receive you, and will be a father unto you, and you shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Cor. vi, 16, 17. Is not this a conversion of relation? The Lord says: "I *will be* a father unto you," which implies that he was not always such; that, on the conditions propounded, their relation should be changed, so that he would be their father, and they should be his sons and daughters.

Peter teaches the same doctrine when he says: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light; *who in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God.*" 1 Pet. ii, 9, 10. Here are persons who, at one time, were not a people, but who have been converted in their relation to God, so that they have become his people. The Lord, by the mouth of his prophet, taught the same doctrine, saying: "I will say to them that were not my people,

Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God." Hos. ii, 23.

The reader will find a commandment in the third chapter of the Acts of the apostles, in which a conversion is named, which must apply to the state, or relation. It reads thus: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Acts iii, 29. Now, the conversion here enjoined must have reference to the state. It can not apply to the heart or the life. All that is meant by a change of life is fully embraced in the word *repent*, as we have seen in the former item. And as no one will reform or repent according to the gospel, whose heart is not converted or changed, it follows that the conversion refers to the state. Over and above, or beyond, a change of heart, and a change or conversion of life, they are commanded to be converted. The command, then, may be paraphrased thus: being truly penitent, reform your lives by ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well, and then change your relation to God's moral government, by entering into the New Covenant, and by taking upon you the yoke, or government of Christ, that you may become the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, and thus enjoy times of refreshing from his divine presence.

There is a very similar injunction found in the second chapter of Acts, which, placed by the side of this, may throw some light upon it. It reads thus: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts ii, 38. Now let us compare these two scriptures, and we shall be the better prepared to understand both.

But before I do this, I will suppose a case. Suppose you hear a preacher address a congregation to-day, in the city

of Indianapolis; some persons become interested on the subject of religion, and ask him what they must do to be saved. He tells them certain things to do, and promises them remission of sins on a compliance with those commands. Suppose, on to-morrow the same man should preach in the city of Cincinnati; some persons, of the same character, become interested, and ask him what they must do to be saved, and he gives them quite a different class of commands, and promises remission of sins on a compliance with these requirements. Now, what would you say of such a religious teacher? You would say that no confidence should be placed in his instructions—that he endeavored to suit his teaching to the notions and opinions of the community where he happened to be.

Now, shall we charge the apostle Peter with such inconsistencies? Remember, these two discourses were delivered by the same inspired Peter, and in the same city, though perhaps not at the same point, and to persons occupying the same position to God's moral government, and but a few hours elapsed between the delivery of these two addresses. Now, we ask, did the apostle agree with himself on these two occasions? Or, did he tell the people one thing to do in order to remission of sins, on the day of Pentecost, and, a few hours after, tell the people, at the beautiful gate of Temple, a different thing to do in order to pardon? No one will charge this ambassador of Christ with acting thus; with thus tampering with the deep agonies of souls convicted of sin. All say that, whether we can understand the apostle or not, he intended to teach the same things in order to pardon, on these two occasions.

With this understanding, then, let us compare these two discourses. The reader will notice that there are just four items in each discourse. In the first discourse, they stand thus: 1, repent; 2, be baptized; 3, the remission of sins;

4, the gift of the Holy Spirit. In the second discourse, they stand thus: 1, repent; 2, be converted; 3, that your sins may be blotted out; 4, when times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord. Now, let us compare these items, and see if they agree. The first item in the first discourse is REPENT; the first item in the second discourse is REPENT. Now, does repentance, in the first discourse, and repentance, in the second discourse mean the same thing? All answer in the affirmative; not a dissenting voice. Well, the third item in the first discourse is "*remission of sins*"; the third item in the second discourse is, "*that your sins may be blotted out.*" Now, do the "*the remission of sins,*" in the first discourse, and the "*blotting out of sins,*" in the second discourse, mean the same thing? All say they do. To blot out sin, and to pardon sins, are two Bible terms, expressive of the very same act. Let us then proceed. The fourth item in the first discourse is, "*and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit*"; the fourth item in the second discourse is, "*when times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.*"

Now, do these items agree? All say they do. All agree that when persons receive the Holy Spirit as a comforter, to revive their broken spirits, and strengthen them with might in the inner man, they have a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. Then we have found that the apostle agrees with himself precisely in three items out of four. Let us now try the second. I passed over that item intentionally. The second item in the first discourse is "BE BAPTIZED;" the second item in the second discourse is "BE CONVERTED." Now, do these items agree? Who will venture the assertion that they do not? No one, I presume, is prepared to make such an assertion. Then, if these items agree, what is the doctrine taught? Reader, don't begin to dodge; stand up to the fair, logical conclusion,

though a whole system should fall by the operation. The plain, naked, unvarnished truth is, that baptism and conversion are used as convertible terms, in a certain sense; that conversion, according to Acts iii, 19, and baptism, according to Acts ii, 38, mean the same thing—or more properly, by baptism, persons are converted.

Reader, do not be alarmed—don't throw down the book at this. Read on; hear us out before you decide the case. Don't forget what we have said on the subject of a change of heart and reformation of life. Notice, we are now treating on a change of state. Baptism can not change the heart—it never was designed to do this. Nor can it change a man's general character—this must be done by reformation. But, although baptism can not change the heart, or the life of a person, it may change his state or relation. This, then is all that we mean when we say that by baptism, according to Acts ii, 38, persons are converted, according to Acts iii, 19.

When a person is so changed in heart as to fall out with his sins, to forsake his evil ways, and turn to the Lord with full purpose of heart, fully resolved to live for him who died for all; and with this determination fully fixed in his heart, is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, into the name of the Father, and Son and Holy Spirit, he changes his relation to God, angels and men. He thus takes the oath of allegiance to the King immortal, invisible, and eternal. He becomes a member of God's family; a citizen of the kingdom of Jesus our Lord.

But the doctrine that a person's state, or relation to God, is changed by baptism, is no new doctrine. It is the doctrine of all the leading parties or sects in Christendom. It is found, more or less plainly expressed, in most of the creeds and commentaries which abound in our land. The seventeenth "article of religion" of the Methodist Episcopal

church says: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others who are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth."

Now, the point in this article to which we direct the special attention is, that baptism is here held to be *a mark of difference* between the baptized and the unbaptized. Then, when a person is baptized, according to this article, he is converted in state.

Dr. Wm. B. Lacey, in his Moral Philosophy, written for "advanced classes in Sunday Schools, and for literary institutions," says: "The sacrament of baptism, in its spiritual operations, constitutes us, in the first instance, members of the Christian church. ° ° ° In the second place, it constitutes us, relatively, the children of God; or, in other words, translates us from an uncovenant into a covenant relation; from a state of nature into a condition of grace. ° ° ° ° In the non-reception of this ordinance, we are in no covenant relation to God whatever; but by submitting to it, we are incorporated into his family, and made his children by adoption and grace." John Wesley, the father of Methodism, taught the same truth. In his note on Rom. vi, 3, he says: "In baptism, we, through faith, are ingrafted into Christ." This certainly is a great change of state. To be taken out of a state of nature and be grafted into Christ. But this change, Wesley says, is effected in baptism. He taught the same doctrine still more fully in his Doctrinal Tracts. He there says: "By baptism we enter into covenant with God; into that everlasting covenant which he hath commanded forever, (Ps. cxi, 9); that new covenant which he promised to make with the spiritual Israel; even to give them a new heart and a new spirit, to sprinkle clean water upon them (of which baptism is only the figure), and to remember their sins

and iniquities no more; in a word, to be their God, as he promised to Abraham, in the everlasting covenant which he made with him and all his spiritual offspring."—[*Doc. Tracts, Conference edition of* 1850, *pp.* 247-8.

Thus did Wesley teach, that by baptism a person is converted *in state.* Indeed, he went so far as to say that infants may thus be converted. He says: "Infants are capable of entering into covenant with God. As they always were, so they still are, under the evangelical covenant. Therefore they have a right to baptism, which is now the entering seal thereof."—[*Doc. Tracts, p.* 254.] This is going further than we are willing to venture

I have not introduced any of the foregoing witnesses to prove the doctrine true, that by baptism a true believer is converted in state, or changed in his covenant relation to God, but to show to the reader that this is no new-fangled idea—that it is sound orthodoxy in all the schools.

Now, all persons who are thus converted in heart, and character, and state, have the promise of Christ that they shall be healed—*that they shall be pardoned;* for says our text, "*that they might be converted, and I should heal them.*" Hence, said Jesus to his apostles: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved;*" or, in the words of our text, shall be healed—being saved and being healed meaning the same thing, namely, pardon of sins.

Here, my Christian reader, I will leave the general subject of conversion, so far as the thing done in conversion is concerned, and will proceed to answer a very important question that is started at this point. One may be ready to ask now, admitting that all I have said is true, How are the hearts of the children of men changed? We have seen what is meant by a change of heart; there is no darkness on that subject; but the question is, How is this change

effected? Is it done with means or without means? Are there any visible instrumentalities employed in effecting this change of heart? Or, is it effected by some mysterious, indefinable influence that passes through the atmosphere, and takes hold of the heart of the man, like a shock of electricity, without the employment of any visible agencies, and thus changes the heart in a moment of time? This, my dear reader, is a question of no ordinary moment, and the answer any one may give to it, will be likely to affect his future course very much. Hence, we should approach it with honest, unprejudiced minds, determined to be satisfied with nothing but the truth of God upon this all important subject.

How, then, is the heart of man to be changed or converted to God? The answer is in the text: "*that they might understand with their heart*, and be converted." Then, in order to a man's conversion, he must understand with his heart. Therefore, the Saviour said, in his explanation of the parable of the sower, found in connection with our text: "When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and *understandeth it not*, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he that received seed by the way-side." Then, speaking of the ground that brought forth fruit, he said, "But he that received seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the word, and *understandeth it*."

By understanding with the heart or judgment, then, the heart or affections are changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness. This is the reason why you can not change the life or actions of one who can not understand with his heart. Take the idiot, who has no understanding, and you can not change his course of life. The reason is, he can not understand the force of argument; he can not appreciate a motive; he can not feel the power of moral suasion

But, do you ask, What is to become of them? Are they to be lost because they can not understand? Infants, too, that die before they are capable of understanding? Are they to be lost? No, gentle reader; their happiness is secured by the death and resurrection of Christ, without the moral means of which we now speak. When the blessed Lord was here on earth, he took little children in his arms and blessed them, and that blessing stands good till the end of time; and all who die before they forfeit it by actual transgressions shall surely rest in the Paradise of God. All the conversion they need to prepare them for heaven is, a change from mortality to immortality. So far as moral qualification is concerned, Jesus says, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Hence, the gospel is not to be preached to such; but it is to be proclaimed to those who have hearts to understand.

But there is another question beyond all this that I must notice. How are persons to understand with their hearts?

The answer to this is also to be found in our text. "*That they might see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them.*" What a beautiful arrangement this is. In order to be pardoned, the sinner must be converted; in order to be converted, he must understand with his heart; in order to understand with his heart, he must see with his eyes and hear with his ears. Hence, the Saviour gives, as a reason why those to whom he refers in our text were not converted, "that their hearts had waxed gross, and their ears were dull of hearing and their eyes they have closed."

Hearts are sometimes changed for the better, and sometimes for the worse. The first change of heart that ever obtained in the family of man was from good to bad. I speak in reference to the case of our mother Eve. Now, what do you suppose was the state of her mind when she

came out of the hands of her Creator? Surely, her heart was then fully reconciled to God; for all that God had made was good—yea, very good. Every pulsation of her righteous soul then beat in harmony with the mind and will of God. Now, had she continued in the same state of mind—had her heart remained unchanged—she never would have touched the prohibited fruit. But her heart was turned away from God; she was converted from good to evil—from virtue to vice—and in this way she was led to violate the law of God.

Now, how was that change affected? Was it not by seeing and hearing, and understanding or believing what she heard? Read the history of the case, as recorded in the Bible. The Devil, in the person of the serpent, came to our mother Eve, in the garden. He seems to have understood something of human nature. He understood that the heart of man must be reached through the eyes and ears, and hence he commenced talking with her. At first, he appeared to have no very special object in view, but only proposed to make a simple inquiry—one about which he felt but little interest, but simply would ask, in passing: "Has God said ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"

Now, this question naturally directed her attention to the tree. She looked at it with more interest than she ever did before. But she answered correctly, only adding a little to what God had said. She replied, "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die."

Now, all this conversation directed her mind to that inhibited tree. There it was, right before her, and she seems to have discovered, for the first time, that the fruit of

that tree was good for food. She never seems to have inquired into the character of this fruit; she knew that the prohibition of God rested upon it, and therefore she never intended to touch it. Hence she did not care whether it was sweet or bitter. But now she looks at it more intensely, and for the first time discovers that it is good for food.

Having gained this far upon her feelings, the serpent comes out plainly and says, "You shall not surely die; for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil." Now, what an effect must this have had upon her heart or affections, when she believed it! She must have reasoned thus: Now my Creator has deceived me. Here is a tree whose fruit is good for food, and it is pleasant to the eyes, and a tree that is to be desired to make me wise, and yet God hath commanded me not to eat it, saying, that if I do I shall die! Surely he has deceived me, and here is a friend who has come to tell me the truth in the case. Thus was her heart turned away from God, "and she took of the fruit thereof and did eat." Thus, by seeing, and hearing, and understanding, and believing what she heard, her heart was changed from a good condition to a bad one, and by one fell act she brought sin, with all its deaths and woes, into our world.

Now, if a falsehood told, heard, understood and believed, turned the heart of man away from God, will not the truth told, heard, understood and believed, turn it back to God again? Most assuredly it will. Hence, from that day, whenever God would reform a man, or a nation of men, he always sent some one to talk to them. When his ancient people would apostatize and turn away from God, he would raise up a prophet, and would put his words in the prophet's mouth, and then send him to the people to l-

converted and reformed, commanding him to say, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken." "Lift up your voice like a trumpet, cry aloud and spare not." "Incline your ears and come unto me; HEAR, and your soul shall live." "Come now and let us reason together." And in all cases when the people would not hear, they were not converted; but where they gave heed to the things that were spoken, and heard with a willing mind, the heart was gained, and the people converted.

The same divine arrangement is carried out in the New Testament. Hence, Jesus said, after he rose from the dead, "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv, 46, 47. And again, said he, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature." Why all this preaching? Why, that the people may see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and thereby understand with their hearts and be converted.

When the Lord appeared to Saul, he said, "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of the things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee, delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee." Now, for what purpose was Saul sent to the Gentiles? The answer is, "*to open their eyes.*" But why open their eyes? Why, that they may see. Then, he was "to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." Acts xxvi, 16, 17, 18.

Now, take all the examples of conversion recorded in the Bible, and where will you find a case of conversion

without hearing? And in our own times, where the hearing ear is not obtained, no conversion obtains. Go to heathen lands, and ask, why are these idol worshipers not converted? It is not because they have no hearts to understand, but because they have not seen with their eyes, and heard the words of truth with their ears. How important, then, is the command, "Let him that hath ears to hear, hear." And, christian reader, how important, too, is the command, "Let your light so shine among men, that they *seeing* your good works may glorify your Father who is in heaven."

But the question may still be asked, what must be seen and heard? what must be understood, in order to conversion?

In answer to this interrogatory, I will present a supposition, illustrative of all that I have said on the subject of *means*, and then close this discourse.

I will suppose a person who has never seen a Bible; he knows nothing of God, nor of his own destiny; he is perfectly ignorant of the things contained in that holy Book. But that volume is now put in his hands; he is capable of reading, and understanding what he reads. He opens the Book and reads: "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." Gen. i, 1. "Thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." Heb. i, 10. He continues to read until he is overwhelmed with the awfully glorious and infinitely powerful character of the eternal Maker of all things.

He again opens the book, and his eyes fall upon those scriptures that describe the awful end of the ungodly—and believing all he reads, his faith carries him down to the dolorous regions of despair, unlocks the awful pit, and

shows him the horrors of the damned. By faith he hears their doleful groans and bitter cries, and he falls back upon himself and says, Alas! that I was born.

But he again looks into the blessed volume, and believing all he reads, his faith takes another direction, and conveys him up to the paradise of God, unlocks the gates of heaven, and shows him the celestial city, with all its holy inhabitants. He contemplates their joys, hears their rapturous songs of praise, until he feels an anxious desire to be one of that happy number.

But he comes to himself, and finds that he is yet in the flesh. He now begins to meditate. I have seen wonderful things out of thy law, O my God; but where am I going? I have seen the horrors of the lost, and the joys of the saved; but to which class do I belong? I know that I must soon die; my friends are dying all around me, and I too must soon fall. But to which of these abodes must I go, when done with time?

While these reflections are occupying his mind, he turns to the Bible and reads: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." "The Lord shall be revealed from heaven, with all his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i, 7, 8. He now inquires, Have I obeyed the gospel? and he reads to see. He finds that his whole life has been contrary to the will of God. Here he finds a command forbidding certain things to be done, but I have done these very things. Here he finds another class of commands, enjoining the performance of certain duties—but I have not done them. Alas! he says, I have sinned

by omission and commission. I am a doomed man. I am exposed every moment to that awful place of torment that I have seen described in the Book of God. O! what shall I do? Are there no means of escape?

While he is awfully alarmed and deeply concerned about his eternal state, he again opens the Bible, and believing all he reads, his faith carries him to the dark garden of Gethsemane, and shows him the man Christ Jesus, prostrate on the cold ground, praying until his sweat becomes as great drops of blood, falling to the ground. He listens, and hears the agonizing Saviour say: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass; nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done." He is astonished at the sight, but does not understand it.

But, by faith, he follows this same personage from the court of the high priest to Pilate's bar, and from thence he follows him up Calvary. He beholds him, finally, nailed to the Roman cross; he views him in all the agonies of death. He has also learned from the holy volume which he has been reading with so much attention, that this is an innocent person. He inquires, therefore, what does all this mean? Why does this innocent person thus suffer?

While these thoughts are stirring within him, he turns to the sacred volume again, and reads: "Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, hath tasted death for every man." "Christ has suffered in the flesh for sins, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God." Well, he says, he is the just one, and I am the unjust; but am I one of those for whom Christ died? He reads again: "Christ gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." "He died for our sins, according to the Scriptures." Then he says he died for me. And is it so—that all the suffering which I have contemplated, was endured on my account? His

thoughts still linger around the cross, until he exclaims—

"Lo Jesus, bleeding on the tree,
There, there the love of God I see.
I look, I gaze, my rebel heart
Feels its own hardness soon depart;
Repenting tears begin to roll,
And love in streams flows through my soul."

Thus, by seeing and hearing of the goodness of God, in the gift and death of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, he is reconciled to God. He loves God because he first loved us, and he repents of his sins, and reforms his life, as a matter of choice; he becomes willing to obey God, in this day of his moral power; he resolves to lead a life of obedience to the revealed will of the Lord; and he exclaims: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" He hears the Lord saying, in the language of his holy apostle: "Repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." He believes the promise, and therefore, with a willing heart, obeys the command; and thus enters into covenant with God, becomes a member of his family, is made free from sin, and now rejoices in hope of the glory of God.

Here, dear reader, we leave the subject with you, adding a word of advice. If you have been thus converted to God, see to it that you stand firm to the end. O, never permit the devil to get the advantage of you. Let not the world, the flesh, nor the devil, ever convert or change your heart back to the love and practice of sin, again; "be ye steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as you know your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

If, however, you have not been thus converted to the Lord and his service, reflect on what you are, and where

you are going. Remember what the Lord has done and suffered for you—

"And let his love your heart constrain,
Nor suffer him to call in vain."

Now is the accepted time, and behold, now is the day of salvation. Then arise at once, and obey the Lord while he is inviting—that you may realize the healing power of the great physician of souls, and thus be made every whit whole.

"None but Jesus, none but Jesus,
Can do helpless sinners good."

Then, cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, and apply at once to the great physician of souls. Comply with the directions given by his holy apostles, though all the doctors of divinity should oppose; obey God, though the heavens should fall, and he will pardon the past, and give you that peace that none but God can give.

SERMON VI.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Rom. v, 1.

THE subject of justification is one of infinite importance to all the sons of men; hence all should be anxious to fully understand it. To aid the anxious, many sermons have been preached, and much has been written upon this subject; and still, intense darkness and mystery settle upon this awfully grand and glorious theme.

To try to shed a ray of light upon the dark path of those who are seeking justification through the blood of the Lamb, is my design in writing and publishing this discourse.

Greenfield defines the word *dikaioō*, from which we have *justified* in the text, thus: "To declare any one to be what he ought to be, and to treat him as such; to declare one to be blameless, or innocent, and to treat him as such; acquit, absolve," etc.

Then when any one is said in scripture to be justified, who has been guilty of transgressing God's righteous commands, we understand that the heavenly Father has acquitted or absolved him from all guilt, and now treats him as if he never had sinned against him; and hence it is said,

"being justified, we have peace with God." God receives those who are justified, into favor with himself: and hence they are said to have "fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." 1 John i, 3. How happy, then, must be the state of the justified. There is no reflection so intolerable as the thought that God disapproves our conduct. To know that wherever we are, at our lying down and uprising, our outgoing and incoming—the disapprobation of heaven rests upon us—who can bear the thought!

But this is no longer the case with those who are justified. They have peace with God, and therefore stand and rejoice in hope of his glory. Yes, they even rejoice in tribulation, because the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts, by the Holy Ghost given unto them.

Now the apostle teaches that we are justified by faith; that it is by faith we have access into this gracious state. If, then, this glorious work is accomplished by faith, there are three questions that naturally arise in the mind:

1. What is the Faith that justifies?
2. How is that Faith obtained?
3. How is that Faith to be employed, or exercised, in order to be justified by it?

A moment's reflection will show the importance of these questions. If we are to be justified by faith, we want to know what faith is—for if we know not what it is, we do not know whether we have it or not—and thus we might be led to seek for that which we already possess. I have no doubt but this very fact has kept many from enjoying the blessing of justification, long after they possessed the faith necessary to give access into this grace. Instead of using their faith in the way the Scriptures require in order to justification, they have spent their time in seeking, they knew not what. But if we find, upon investigation, that

we have not faith, we then wish to know how this faith is to be obtained, that we may seek so as to find. If, however, we find we have the faith, and are not justified, we want to know how this faith is to be employed in order to bring the blessing of justification.

Our future remarks upon this subject, then, will be directed to these interrogations.

I. And first, what is that faith by which a sinner is justified? Now faith is one of those simple terms that can be made but little plainer by exposition. It is perfectly understood when applied to any proposition in the universe, excepting that of religion. Why is this the case? It is believed among all Christians, that the Bible contains a revelation from God. A revelation is "the act of disclosing to others what was before unknown to them." (See Webster's Dic.)

Now, reader, suppose I propose to reveal something to you which you did not know before, and in making that revelation I employ words as the signs of the ideas I wish to communicate, with which you are well acquainted. You fully understand their meaning, as used on all other occasions, but I do not intend these words shall be so understood in this revelation. I have some secret meaning for these words, and yet I do not tell you what that meaning is. I ask, does not this communication fail to be a revelation to you? Nay, it is worse than no communication, for you are misled by the words which I employ. You receive the wrong idea, and having learned that fact, you are left without any definite idea *at all.*

Now we have said, the Bible contains a revelation from God to man. Faith is one of the words employed in that divine communication; and now I ask if this term is not to be understood in the Bible according to its common acceptation, how shall we know what is affirmed? We can

not. We will not, therefore, charge the spirit of all grace with thus mocking the miseries and wants of the children of men. In Heb. xi, 1, Paul thus defines faith: "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." He then gives this example: "Through faith, we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." Here faith is the evidence, or conviction, of that which we see not. We did not see God frame the universe by his almighty word, but by faith we understand the fact. That is, faith is the firm conviction or belief of this truth. In the sixth verse of the same chapter, the apostle says: "Without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Here the apostle uses the terms *faith* and *belief*, as expressive of the same idea. Belief that God is, and that he is a rewarder of those who seek him diligently, is the faith that is necessary, in order to please God. In a word, the faith necessary to justification, is the cordial and undoubting reception of the whole revelation of God to man, contained in that best of all books, the BIBLE.

But through mercy and goodness, the heavenly father has embodied the essence and soul-stirring influence of this whole revelation, in three great facts, viz: "That Christ Jesus died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures." 1 Cor. xv, 3, 4. And to make the matter still more simple, and thus to adapt it more fully to our weak capacity, he has summed up the truth of these facts in one leading and fundamental proposition, viz: THAT JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. This truth is so interwoven with the whole revelation of God to our world, that when it is believed with all the heart, we embrace with it all the truths, facts, and promises contained

in the sacred volume. If we believe that Christ is the Son of God, we believe that he died, was buried, and rose for us. And if we believe this, we believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of all who seek him aright.

This view of the subject is an entire refutation of the strongest arguments used by the Roman Catholic clergy, against the doctrine that the Bible is the only rule of faith. They say if this is so, we must read and understand every sentence, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, before we can have faith, or before we know whether we have true faith or not.

We are willing to admit—nay, we are sure—that the more we know of God and his works, as developed in the different dispensations, the more enjoyment we have in our union with him. But it can not be proved that universal knowledge of all God's dealings, ancient and modern, with men and angels, was ever required, by an apostle, of any man in order to justification. "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest," was the language of Philip to the Ethiopian. And when he replied, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," he baptized him and he went on his way rejoicing.

The only way in which we can justify this procedure is upon the principle just stated—that is, that this truth is so connected with the whole economy of salvation, that, believing it, we embrace the whole. Now he that believes this truth with all his heart, may have access into the grace of justification, and may there stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

He may then go on to add to this faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, until he arrives to the stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus. And as he grows in the knowledge

of our Lord Jesus Christ, mercy, grace and peace will be multiplied unto him.

II. Having seen what that faith is that brings the blessing of justification, we will now proceed to consider our second question: How is that faith obtained?

In answer to this question, read the following scriptures: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." John xx, 30, 31. Here the apostle teaches that that faith which gives life in the name of Jesus, which is the faith by which we are justified, is to be obtained through the writings of the witnesses of our Lord and Saviour. Notice, the apostle does not merely say that these things were performed that we might believe; but that they were *written* for that purpose. In perfect accordance with this, is the language of our Saviour, recorded in John xvii, 20. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word," etc. This passage shows as clear as cloudless noon-day, that persons are to believe on Christ, through the word of God, communicated to us by his holy apostles.

The next proof that I will advance is that very familiar scripture, found in Rom. x, 17: "So then faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." That is just saying that faith comes by hearing the word of God. The reader will notice that this is a general conclusion to which the apostle comes, after asking many very important questions, and this too in the same general connection in which our text stands. It would seem that, after the apostle had stated the general fact that we are justified by faith, and having removed every objection to the justification of the

Gentiles by the same faith, he anticipated the very question which we are now considering, and, as if to hush to silence all caviling on the subject, he says, "Faith comes by hearing the WORD OF GOD."

We will now present the reader a few examples, in which this doctrine is carried out in a practical illustration. In the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we learn that when the supernatural endowment of the Holy Ghost was received by these apostles, accompanied by a sound as of a mighty, rushing wind, attended by blazing tongues, which sat on each of them, the wondering multitude cried out, "These men are full of new wine." All will admit that at this time they had not the faith necessary to justification. These stupendous miracles gave no faith in the name of Christ until they were accompanied by the "WORD OF GOD." But when the divine testimony of the heavenly Father, as spoken by Joel, and David, and these newly-inspired apostles of the Lamb, was addressed to their understanding, it carried conviction home to their hearts, and they "*said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" Thus you perceive that these persons obtained faith by hearing the "WORD OF GOD."

Of the Samaritans, it is said, "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Acts viii, 12. The Samaritans, then, obtained faith by hearing Philip announce the "WORD OF GOD." Again: "And it came to pass in Iconium, that they (Paul and Barnabas) went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude, both of the Jews and also of the Greeks, believed." Acts xvi, 1. Thus did all this multitude believe "by hearing the WORD OF GOD" proclaimed by Paul and Barnabas. Once

more: "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ. And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few." Acts xvii, 2–4. Now, I ask, by what means did this people obtain faith? Paul, "as his manner was," announced the great facts concerning Christ, viz: that he died for our sins, was buried, and rose again from the dead, but no person believes these things. The apostle knowing that "faith comes by hearing the WORD OF GOD," proclaimed that divine testimony in their hearing for three Sabbath days in succession, and the result was that many believed.

When Paul came to Corinth and proclaimed the "WORD OF GOD," it is said "many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized." Acts xviii, 8. The Corinthians, then, believed by hearing the "WORD OF GOD." In accordance with this fact, the apostle asks them, "who then is Paul or Apollos but ministers by whom you believed?" 1 Cor. iii, 5.

From the testimony now presented, illustrated, and enforced by the numerous examples which we have submitted, we shall consider that it is fully proved that the faith which is necessary in order to justification, is obtained through the word of God, given by holy prophets and apostles, and recorded in the sacred volume, the BIBLE.

We have been thus particular, because we know there are some popular objections to the doctrine which we have here advanced, some of which we will now consider.

1. It is objected that this makes faith rest on the word of man, inasmuch as the scriptures were written by men.

Answer.—Christ said to his Father, in reference to his

apostles: "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them." John xvii. Then if we "*believe through their word*," we believe through the word of God. When Paul preached to the Thessalonians, he said they received his preaching "not as the word of man, but as it is in truth, the word of God." 1 Thess. ii, 13. To prove to all, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the apostles proclaimed the word of God, "God bore them witness, by signs and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his will." Heb. ii, 4. In view of this fact, Paul said to the Corinthians, "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." 1 Cor. ii, 4, 5. The demonstration of the spirit here spoken of, was not the kind of spiritual demonstration we hear so much about in this our day, but it was the divers miracles and supernatural works performed by the apostles through the Holy Spirit, in demonstration of the truth of their teaching and doctrine. He, then, that believes on Jesus Christ through the living testimony of our God, contained in the scriptures given by inspired apostles and prophets, bases his faith not on the wisdom of man, but on the power of God. A sure foundation, indeed, on which to build our faith.

2. Again: It is objected that faith produced by the word of God is historical faith, whereas the faith that justifies is experimental faith.

Answer.—Strictly speaking, there can be no such thing as experimental faith, though all who believe have a corresponding experience. Hence, John says: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." 1 John v, 10. That is, he has the witness in himself that he does believe. He has an experimental consciousness within

himself that he does believe on the Son of God. The same is true in reference to any proposition believed. This experience, however, is not faith, but the effect of it.

Reader, suppose you receive a letter from a friend informing you that some of your relations had entered into an arrangement by which you were to receive ten thousand dollars, and that the money was ready for you. If you believe it, you are glad. You experience joy. But you do not believe because you are glad, but you are glad because you believe. Your faith, then, is not experimental; it rests on the testimony of another. Suppose A to have been sorely afflicted. If B should ask him if he had been sick, he would not say he believed he had. That he had been sick would be a matter of experience or knowledge with him, and not a matter of faith. Upon A's word, B may believe it. Then that A was sick, is a matter of knowledge with A, and of faith with B. Thus you perceive that there can be no such thing as experimental faith, for whenever anything becomes a matter of experience, it is a matter of knowledge, and ceases to be a matter of faith. If you call faith historical because produced by testimony, then all faith is historical, for all faith is produced by testimony, either human or divine. The faith for which we contend may be called divine, because produced by divine testimony.

3. It has been further objected that the faith that justifies is evangelical faith, but the faith produced by the gospel testimony is not evangelical.

Answer.—The word *evangelical* has become as popular as the word *orthodox* once was. Indeed, it seems to have taken its place. Hence, we do not now hear so much about the orthodox sects, but the watch-word now is, "*the evangelical branches of Christ's church.*"

Now, I affirm, according to the first and primary meaning of the word evangelical, that there can not be two

evangelical churches in the world. What does this word mean? "*According to the gospel,*" Webster gives as its first meaning. Then, for a church to be evangelical, it must be according to the gospel. Can two churches, then, which are not like each other, both be according to the gospel? Surely not, if the gospel is consistent with itself. Then they can not both be evangelical. After all the noise about evangelical churches, I doubt very much whether any one of all the sectarian parties now in Christendom can be proved to be evangelical. Will any one undertake it? This, however, by the way.

Having ascertained the meaning of the word evangelical, we will now notice the objection proposed.

To say that faith produced by the gospel is not evangelical, is to say that the gospel produces faith which is contrary to the gospel! For if it is not evangelical faith, it is not according to the gospel, and if it is not according to the gospel, it must be contrary to it. This would be a violation of that universal law, that everything should bring forth after its kind. If the gospel produces faith, it must be according to the gospel, and therefore is evangelical.

O, who can tell the evils that have grown out of these metaphysical expositions of faith.

How often do we find persons who have all confidence in Christ as the only refuge of a sinking world, but who, when just about to venture on him, according to the gospel, for salvation, are told that they have no faith. The preacher tells them that faith is a divine substance imparted to the heart by some superhuman power, and that they can no more believe than make a world, until they receive that influence. Struck with astonishment, they go to hear another teacher. He tells them that all the first teacher has said is true, but that they must come to the Lord and ask for faith, and he will give it. But before

this teacher is through, he tells them that what is not of faith is sin; and that they can not come to God so as to be accepted, without faith. Now they are confused—they know not what to do. One says, I have no faith; God alone can give me faith; but he has promised nothing to those who ask in unbelief. O, what shall I do?

Now to all such I would say, that if you do believe confidently that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and Saviour of sinners, just come right along to him. Let all those human systems go; cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, and rely alone on the name of Christ for salvation.

One remark further on the subject of faith, and we will proceed to our third question. Some say, they understand faith to mean trust in Christ, or strong confidence in the Lord. Now I would suppose that trust or confidence in Christ was the effect of faith, and not faith itself. But as we have no idea that any person will ever be justified by faith, who does not trust in Christ, and rely on him wholly for salvation, we will reason on the subject for a moment, as if this were the true meaning of faith. Two things are to be considered, when we trust in Christ for salvation—first, his power to save; and secondly, his willingness to save. If we doubt either, we will not be disposed to trust in him. Now, with these two points in mind, let me ask, what is better calculated to give confidence in the power of Christ to save, than the gospel, or "word of God"? It unfolds to view the stupendous miracles which he performed, in proof of his mighty power. It teaches that he opened the eyes of the blind, unstopped the ears of the deaf, caused the lame man to leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb to sing; that the winds and seas were subject to his command; that he cast out demons, and even raised the dead. But pursue the gospel account of the

Saviour still further, and see him rising from the dark silence of the tomb, and unfurling the banner of immortality and eternal life over the cold grave of Joseph, thus inspiring a cheerless world with the hope of "an inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. i, 3, 4. Who, I ask, after all these displays of mighty power, can doubt Christ's ability to save sinners?

But do we doubt his willingness to save? Then look at his sufferings on our account, as revealed in the gospel. See him lay aside that glory which he had with the Father, before the world was, and become a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief. Behold his tender mercies extended to all the sons of affliction who called upon him while he was in the flesh. Follow him to the gloomy garden of Gethsemane, at the dark hour of midnight, and see him there, prostrate on the cold ground, praying until his sweat became as great drops of blood, falling to the ground. Behold him crowned with thorns and clothed in mock robes, to all of which he submits without a single murmur. But to close the scene of suffering on our behalf, see him nailed to the Roman cross, and even there you see his mercy expressed in prayers for his murderers, while in the very agonies of death. While he suffers, all nature bears testimony to his divinity. The earth trembles to her solid base, and the mighty rocks are torn asunder; the bright luminary of day throws a dark vail of mourning over his glorious face, and even the vail of the Jewish temple is rent in twain, from top to bottom. Surely, if all these manifestations of love, expressed in sweat, and tears, and blood, and death, will not inspire the believer's heart with confidence in the willingness of Christ to save sinners, nothing in the vast universe of the Almighty would. And let it be remembered, that all these glorious facts we learn

in the gospel, or the word of God, so that, even according to this last definition of faith, all must see that "faith comes by hearing the word of God."

III. We now come to our third question, viz: How must faith be employed, in order to be justified by it?

I would now inquire, first of all, does faith justify? We answer with an emphatic NO; for the apostle says, "it is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?" Rom. viii, 33, 34. If, then, it is God who justifies, or pardons the sinner—and yet, it is said, we are justified by faith—I ask again, is there anything meritorious in faith? Does the sinner merit pardon by believing? No one will affirm that he does; for this would be to say that there is so much value in faith, that we could even purchase a seat in the world of glory with it! This would make the enjoyment of heaven to be of debt, and not by grace. If, then, it is God that justifies, and we are justified by faith—and yet, faith does not purchase pardon—we ask again, does faith influence God to pardon the believer? Does the powerful influence of faith pass upon the supreme Being, and move him to be gracious to the sinner? Does faith "MOVE THE HAND THAT MOVES THE WORLD?"

From the manner in which some talk, and teach, and pray, I suppose that they think that faith has some controlling influence on the mind of the Saviour. The reader, no doubt, has often witnessed the scenes which transpire at camp-meetings, and even other meetings where there is much excitement, and where there are many desiring to obtain that justification whereof we speak. Now I refer to these customs with due regard for the good feelings of all who thus practice. But the public practice and teaching, of any body of professing Christians, is public property, and ought to be made a matter of public conversation, and investigation, inasmuch as we are all liable to err. By this

means, we may be enabled to correct many improprieties which we might never see without pursuing this course.

Then to return to the subject we had in view. When a number of persons come forward to the "*mourner's bench*," or modern altar, to seek justification, how often do we hear the leaders exhort their brethren thus: Now, brethren, let us besiege a throne of grace by faith and prayer, and let us never give over until these anxious souls are justified. Influenced by this exhortation, some ten, fifteen, or twenty persons will sometimes engage in public prayer at the same time. One who knew no better, would suppose that they were trying to see who could pray the loudest, as if they believed that the loudest prayer would have the most influence on the Saviour.

We often hear the "mourners" exhorted to "act faith on Christ." Is not that saying that their faith is to act upon Christ so as to obtain his favor? Sometimes, we have heard them told to lay hold of the Saviour *by faith*, and never let him go until he bless you. This is certainly saying, that the sinner's faith is to move God to justify him who exerts it. We sometimes hear these expressions: "O for a little more faith;" "Lord, come and give us that faith that takes no denial." And I once heard a man in one of these scenes, cry out at the very top of his voice, "O Lord, come and give us that faith that says, IT SHALL BE DONE!" I have often thought of that prayer, and the doctrine expressed by it, since I heard it. Was it not virtually saying to the good Being, Lord, here are persons who want to be justified, and I have the will, but not the power to do the work. You, Lord, have the power, but lack the will. Now, Lord, just resign your supreme authority into my hands, and then I will compel you to pardon them all in a moment!

But to say the very least, all this practice and teaching

does convey the idea that these people do believe that faith has an influence on the Deity; and that when they say that a sinner is justified by faith, they mean that faith influences God to justify him. O! how far will honest men let their feelings lead them!

Now, I have not the most distant idea that our faith has any influence whatever on the mind of our Heavenly Father. The scriptures abundantly teach that he is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; that God changes not; and that he always stands with arms spread wide, ready to receive and pardon the repenting sinner, whenever he complies with the terms which he has ordained.

The question then may recur, what has faith to do in this great work? I will simply say, that all the power and influence of the believer's faith passes on himself—on his own heart and will—and is the moral lever which turns his heart over to the Lord, and influences him to comply with God's terms of pardon; and when this point is gained in the sinner's heart by faith, and he complies, God pardons his sins—not because his faith has overcome the supreme Being—but because it has overcome the sinner's will, and brought him where the Lord promised to pardon.

Before I proceed to investigate the subject farther, I wish to state a few plain propositions:

1. "It is God that justifies." This we have stated before, but I wish it to be riveted on every mind. We can not pardon our own sins, nor the sins of our neighbor. If we are ever pardoned, God must do it.

2. If God justifies a sinner at all, he does it on the principle of mercy. We can not purchase pardon of the Lord, for this plain reason: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." We have nothing which we can call our own, with which to purchase God's favor. We, ourselves, belong to God, with all we have and are. Should

the sinner offer his body as a ransom for his soul, the Lord might respond, "You belong to me, both soul and body." O! when we take this view of the subject of justification, who will not stand, and wonder, and adore the grace of God, who has thus offered pardon to a rebellious world, "without money and without price"?

3. God has a right, as the Sovereign of the universe, to stipulate his own terms of pardon, or justification. No person can object to this, seeing that the Lord pardons of entire mercy, without any merit on our part. If we purchased pardon of the Lord, then we might with some propriety desire to have some hand in stipulating the terms. But as we are poor, helpless, blind, sinful, and rebellious creatures, we should be willing for the merciful Father of spirits to set his own terms of pardon. Though all admit the truth of this proposition, yet many terms of pardon have been offered to the world, which God never proposed, but which are the mere inventions of men!

4. If God proposes terms of pardon to man, for man's benefit, it is reasonable to suppose that these terms will be so plainly revealed, that all persons interested may understand and comply with them. This, we affirm, is true in reference to the gospel terms of pardon—so that no person who learns what to do to be saved, from the New Testament, need go seeking pardon for weeks, and months, and even years, as some have done.

5. The last proposition that I now wish to make is, that if God has stipulated his own terms of pardon, we ought to submit and comply with them if we wish to be pardoned. We ought not to utter the first murmur, nor raise the least objection, but we should go forward and obey God and live.

But the man without faith has no disposition or will to comply with these terms, and hence, he remains unjustified.

But when he believes in Christ with all his heart, he beholds by faith the overwhelming facts of the gospel, which express the love of God to a ruined world in such strong terms that his heart is affected, and he cries out,

"I yield, I yield:
I can hold out no more
I sink, by dying love compelled,
And own thee conqueror."

Thus his faith subdues his will, and purifies his heart, and influences him to say, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The gospel directs him to heaven's appointed terms of pardon. Moved forward by the mighty power of his faith in all the facts, commands, and promises of the gospel, he complies with these terms and is justified, and "stands and rejoices in hope of the glory of God."

The Bible furnishes many examples illustrative of what we have now stated. In the eleventh chapter of Hebrews we find some very striking ones. In verse 29, it is said: "By faith they (the children of Israel) passed through the Red sea as by dry land," etc.

Now, it is just as positively asserted in this passage that the children of Israel passed through the Red Sea *by faith*, as it is in our text that we are justified by faith. The same phraseology is used in the two cases. If then we can learn how Israel passed through the Red Sea by faith, it will show us how a sinner is justified by faith. What are the facts, then, in the case of Israel? When, as the messenger of God, Moses had brought that people unto the Red Sea, their hearts failed them. When they saw the proud billows rolling high before them, while wave after wave lashed the shore at their feet, and, understanding that Pharaoh, with mighty hosts, was pursuing them hard by, they cried out unto Moses, "Because there were no graves

in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness? It had been better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in the wilderness." Ex. xiv, 11, 12. But, after Moses had stilled the people by telling them to stand still and see the salvation of the Lord, directed by Omnipotence, he stretched the rod he held in his hand over the waters, and they divided hither and thither and stood as walls on either hand. Then God, by the mouth of Moses, said to the people, "GO FORWARD." Now, all must see in a moment that obedience to that command was necessary in order to their deliverance, and that faith was necessary in order to that obedience. Suppose that they had looked at these mountains of water on each hand, and then looked down into the bed of the Red Sea, until they doubted the will or power of God to hold back the waters until they all reached the other shore, do you suppose they would have gone forward? Surely not. They would have stood trembling and doubting, until Pharaoh would have come down upon them with all his mighty hosts, and led them back to Egypt as his lawful subjects. So, I awfully fear, some will stand doubting whether God will save them even if they obey his plain commands, until one mightier than Pharaoh shall take them to eternity unprepared. Israel, however, believed that what God had promised he would perform, and what he had now undertaken he would accomplish. Encouraged and strengthened by this faith, they obeyed God. They ventured down into the very bed of the Red Sea, and, influenced by faith, they passed forward until they were heard to sing the song of deliverance on the other shore. Then they did not sit still, and believe themselves across these mighty deeps, nor did they transport themselves to the other shore by a mere "*act of faith*;" but faith influenced them to obey God, walking through the Red Sea, as on dry land. Just so I understand a sinner is justified by

faith. Faith takes away every objection to obedience, and leads him to a compliance with heaven's terms of justification.

Perhaps some may now be ready to object to the view which we have presented, because it destroys the doctrine of justification by *faith alone*, which they conceive to be taught in the text under consideration. If you will look again, my brother, you will see that the little particle *alone* is not in the text. If Paul had said we are justified by *faith alone*, he would have contradicted James, who says: "Ye see how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." James ii, 25. There is one fact of much importance in the case of these two apostles, and that is, that they both refer to Abraham, the father of the faithful, as an example by which to illustrate their doctrine of justification. From this fact we may infer that both designed to teach the same doctrine.

But one may be ready to ask, does not Paul teach that Abraham was justified without works? He says: "If Abraham were justified by works he hath whereof to glory, but not before God." Rom. iv, 2. On the plan of justification which Paul taught, boasting was excluded. See Rom. iii, 27. But I ask if those who teach that "justification by faith alone is a wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort," have not as much room for boasting in their system as those have who teach a gospel obedience in order to justification? They exhort the people to believe unto life; to lay hold of the Saviour by faith, and never let him go until he bless them, which certainly gives the person who believes that he obeys this exhortation, grounds to boast over those who have not faith enough to thus hold the Saviour fast. But those who teach the gospel plan of salvation make no effort to move God to be merciful. They do not ask him to change his own arrangement for salvation.

They claim no part in fixing the terms of pardon. They ask nothing on the ground of merit, either for believing or obeying, but they simply commit their souls' eternal interest unto the Lord in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator. Now, I ask, whose system gives the most room for boasting?

I have long thought, however, that it was doing great injustice to any writer, whether inspired or uninspired, to take a small scrap, say a sentence, or part of a sentence, out of his writings, and from that form our opinions of his whole belief. That we may, therefore, do the apostle Paul, and the subject under consideration, as well as our readers, ample justice, we will now go into an examination of the apostle's whole argument, found in connection with Rom. v, 1, and I think that we shall be able, not only to reconcile Paul and James, but also to make it plain that Paul to the Romans teaches the very doctrine which we have now presented.

But before we open the book, I wish to make a few general statements, to prepare our minds for the investigation. It will be admitted by all, that to understand an argument in all its force and application, it is necessary to know the proposition to be proved by it. For example, I might state a proposition in the hearing of a congregation, and commence presenting arguments to prove it. Suppose a person comes in after the proposition is presented, and therefore hears my arguments without knowing what I intended to prove by them, and leaves before I make the application—could he see all the force and beauty of the argument? No; he might even draw doctrines from my language which I never intended to teach. But those who know the proposition I am aiming to prove, know just what use to make of my arguments. They can take them and place them up by the side of the proposition, and see their

applicability to it, and determine whether they sustain it or not. And when they have done this, no honest man among them will go further. They will not push my arguments further than I intended, or beyond what I aimed to prove by them. To do this would be to do me injustice, and to practice an imposition on all who might hear them.

Just so we say in relation to the arguments introduced in the New Testament by the apostles. To understand them, and see their power and beauty, we must consider the points which they intended to prove by them; and we should never push any argument used by an apostle beyond what he intended. The points to be proved by an apostolic argument may generally be learned by carefully reading the whole context, and noticing the general conclusions which the writer has drawn.

For want of attention to these things, much, very much, of the confusion which now exists in the religious world has originated. Teachers of religion have taken single expressions in the middle of arguments, and, without considering the nature of the arguments in which they stand, or the propositions to be proved by them, have used them as if they contained the whole of the apostles' teaching, and have thus built doctrines and systems of doctrines, on these expressions, which the apostles never intended nor even thought of. And the epistle we have now under consideration has been treated in this way more, perhaps, than any other part of the New Testament.

To prepare us, then, for a correct understanding of that part of this epistle which we shall examine, we will state emphatically, that Paul's letter to the Romans is an argumentative document. At the time that this letter was written, there was one leading subject of controversy which occupied the minds of both believing Jews and Gentiles, namely: shall the believing Gentiles be admitted to all the

blessings of the gospel in common with the believing Jews? Paul took the affirmative, and the Jews the negative of this question. Now, to prove that we are correct in our general statements so far, the reader will please turn to and read Acts xi, 2, 3; 1 Thess. ii, 15, 16.

In this epistle, as well as in Galatians and Ephesians, Paul presents his leading arguments in support of the ground he occupied on this subject. Even in the first chapter and fifth verse, he begins to show the design of his arguments. He says, speaking of Christ, "By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations, for his name." This verse contains two important items: 1. That the design of his apostleship was not to teach men that they could be justified by *faith alone*, but that in order to enjoy the blessing of faith, there must be obedience to the faith, (or to the gospel—the effect, which is faith, being put for the cause, which is the gospel). 2. That this obedience by faith was to be preached among all nations—thus intimating that all men, both Jew and Gentile, might perform this obedience, and be justified. At verse sixteen he comes out more plainly, and says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Here the apostle declares to the Jew, that the gospel exerts as much saving power on the heart of a believing Gentile, as it does on the heart of a believing Jew; and he offers this as a reason why he is not ashamed of it. Query: Would not Paul, were he here now, be ashamed of that perversion of the gospel which offers its blessings only to a part of the human family, passing the rest by to perish in their sins?

To show that the Jew could claim nothing over the Gentile on account of his former good works, the apostle notices the character of both—of the Gentiles in the first chapter,

and of the Jews in the third. In the second chapter, he testifies that the name of God was blasphemed among the Gentiles, on account of the wickedness of the Jews.

Before introducing the character of the Jews, in chapter third, he presents this question and answer to them: "Are we [Jews] better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Verse 9. He then points out their awful character, and closes by saying: "Now we know that whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Verse 9. Thus the apostle places all the world, nationally, both Jews and Gentiles, on common ground—so far as moral conduct is concerned—and by this course proves to the Jews, that God has acted justly and graciously, in offering the salvation of the gospel to Jews and Gentiles, on the same principles.

But we have not room to notice all the apostle's arguments introduced in this epistle, to prove his proposition. We hope we have presented enough to show that one leading design of this letter, was to prove that God has put no difference between Jews and Gentiles, purifying their hearts by faith. If the reader, however, desires more proof, he is referred to Rom. iii, 29; iv, 9–11; ix, 24–25; x, 12.

Having gained this point, the Jew would say: "Well, we will admit that the Gentiles may be justified and saved, if they will be circumcised and keep the law of Moses." See Acts xv, 1, 2. This brought up another proposition for discussion, viz: Must the Gentiles be circumcised, and do the works required in Moses' law, in order to be justified? On this proposition, the Jews affirmed, and Paul denied. Before the apostle commences his argument on this subject, he makes one sweeping proposition: "*Therefore, by*

the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight;" iii, 20. But the Jew would say, How, then, are we to be justified? The apostle answers: "But now the righteousness of God (or God's righteous system of justification) without the law, is manifested (or revealed), being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of (in) Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Verse 21, etc.

The apostle proceeds to state, that God has set Christ forth to be a propitiation (or mercy seat), to declare his righteousness for the remission of past sins, through faith in his blood. Thus he would teach the Jews, that instead of seeking justification now, by going to the mercy seat in the holy place made by hands, they must come to Christ, by faith in his blood, in order to be justified. That he is the mercy seat now, from or through whom God is declared to be just, when he justifies him that believes in Jesus. He then inquires, "Where is boasting?—it is excluded. By what law?—of works? Nay, but by the law of faith." Verse 27. That the law of works here named, was the law of Moses, which the Jews said the Gentiles must keep, in order to be saved, no one, we presume, will deny; and that the law of faith is the same which is called in viii, 2, "the law of the spirit," we think will also be admitted. By this law of faith, or of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, Paul, with all Christians in his day, were made free from the law of sin and death, on such principles as excluded all boasting. "Therefore, we conclude (says Paul), that a man is justified by faith (or the law of faith which he had just mentioned), without the deeds of the law," (the law of Moses).

We will now proceed to the two illustrious examples

introduced by the apostle in the fourth chapter, to confirm the doctrine he had advanced, viz: that of Abraham and David. And while we examine these examples, let it be remembered that Paul is still arguing that the Gentiles, and all others, may now be justified without the deeds of the law of Moses; that by these works, no flesh shall be justified in the sight of God. As David's case occurred during the life-time of the law, we will examine it first.

In chapter iv, 6–8, Paul says: "David, also, describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." This is a quotation from Psalm xxxii, where David speaks of his own pardon of the sin of shedding blood, in the case of Uriah. See 2 Sam. xi, 15–17. We have a prayer of David in the 51st Psalm, in reference to this crime, in which he says, "Deliver me from blood-guiltiness, O God, for thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it. Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit." This prayer most evidently refers to the sin of shedding the blood of Uriah, and the reason why he said God required no sacrifice in his case, was because the law admitted of none. For the pardon of the sin which David had committed, the law made no provision, but declared most positively, that "whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death." "Moreover, ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer who is guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death." Num. xxxv, 30, 31. See the whole chapter.

With this law before his mind, David might well say, "Thou desirest not sacrifice," etc. That David is considered the real murderer of Uriah, is evident from what Nathan the prophet said unto him: "*Thou art the man,*"

said he; "thou hast killed Uriah, the Hittite, with the sword." 2 Sam. xii, 8, 9. Yet God, for some wise purpose, authorized the prophet to say to David: "The Lord also hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die." Verse 13. In view of this fact, David said, "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered;" and Paul, knowing that this pardon was obtained without the deeds of the law, says that David, in this passage, "describeth the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works." But the Jew might now say to the apostle, What does all this prove? The reply is easy. If God pardoned David without the deeds of the law, then the Gentiles may now be justified without the works of the law. That this is the point in this argument, is clear, from the question with which it is closed: "Cometh this blessedness, then, upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also?" V. 9.

We will now proceed to consider the example of Abraham, the father of the faithful, as employed by the apostle Paul, to illustrate and enforce his doctrine of justification. The reader will now turn to the fourth chapter of Romans, and examine it carefully as he peruses this part of this discourse. Paul says, "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God." V. 2. That is, if Abraham merited justification by the works of the law, then he might glory in his own performance, but not in God's grace. "For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." It was reckoned a righteous thing for him to believe God. "Now to him that worketh, is the reward reckoned not of grace, but of debt." V. 4. That is, if he merit the reward by his works, he receives it as a debt due him, and not as a matter of grace. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the

ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." V. 5. He that does not perform the works of the law, but believes on God, that faith is counted unto him as righteous, though he be not circumcised. If the apostle, in these verses, does not refer to the works of the law, there is no force in his argument *at all.* We must remember that Paul is here reasoning with the Jews, who said, "Except a man be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, he can not be saved." Acts xv. This, Paul denies; and while reasoning on the subject, makes the declarations quoted above. He had already said, in this same argument, "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in the sight of God; and that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." Ch. iii, 20–28. Having thus so distinctly named the works of the law, it was not necessary for him to mention the law every time he named these works. But lest some should forget what kind of works he was speaking of, and thus be misled, he says, at verse 13, "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith; for if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." V. 13, 14. That is, if a person is made heir of the blessings of the gospel, merely because he belongs to, or does the works of the law, faith in God, in his promise, and in his Son our Saviour, is worthless, and God's promise is made of none effect, or it has failed—for that promise said, "*In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed,*" without saying one word about the law, and even before it was given.

But let us hear the apostle further. "We say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." V. 9-11. Now, reader, do you see the point in this argument? If you do not consider the proposition to be proved by it, I know you do not. Remember, then, that Paul is arguing that men may be justified without the deeds of the law. Then the argument stands thus: Abraham's faith was counted to him for righteousness when he was in uncircumcision, and he was justified before the giving of the law, therefore the Gentiles and all others may now have an acceptable faith without circumcision, and may be justified without the deeds of Moses' law. This argument could not be withstood by any honest Jew.

But the apostle goes on to state that Abraham received this seal of the righteousness of his faith "that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had, being yet uncircumcised." V. 11, 12. This declaration speaks volumes. It shows that righteousness may be imputed or reckoned to both Jews and Gentiles without the deeds of the law, from the fact that Abraham stands as the father of all believers who walk in the steps of his faith. It also shows that Abraham's faith was a moving, acting, walking faith, and it has left its footsteps behind, and now if we wish to have our faith reckoned to us for righteousness, we must walk in the steps of that faith. Notwithstanding the apostle has been arguing that it is not necessary to do the works of the law in order to be justified, he here shows plainly that if we wish to enjoy the blessings of justification, we must do as Abraham did—we must obey God—for this did Abraham.

Now, we ask, where is the disagreement between Paul and James? Paul does not say that Abraham performed no acts of obedience in order to his justification, but that he did not do the deeds of the law. This was all it was necessary for him to prove in order to sustain the cause for which he plead. The apostle James, however, has another subject under consideration, and is arguing in reference to another law, which he calls the perfect law of liberty." Ch. i, 25. In order to be justified by this law, James teaches that obedience to its commands is necessary, and even goes so far as to say that faith without works is dead. Ch. ii, 26. To prove this position, he brings forth the example of Abraham, and says: "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." Ch. ii, 21-23. The reader must remember that Abraham's obedience in offering his son Isaac on the altar, was performed before the law of Moses was given, and therefore could not be reckoned among the works of the law of which Paul speaks when speaking of the justification of Abraham without works.

It is no more than just, however, to let every writer explain his own teaching; therefore we will hear Paul again: "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, saying, Surely, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife." Heb. vi, 13, etc. Now, when did God confirm the promise made to Abraham by an oath? We answer, when

he had offered his son upon the altar, which the reader will see by referring to Genesis xxii, 15, 16. "And the angel of the Lord called to Abraham out of heaven, the second time, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee," etc. This is the first, and perhaps the only time that God confirmed the promise made to Abraham by an oath, and therefore must be the time referred to in Heb. vi, 13-15.

And now, by referring to the customs of men, he shows that at this time God removed all doubt or strife in reference to that promise, by confirming it in the most solemn manner. As if he had said, Abraham believed God's promise made to him at different times, and his faith was reckoned as righteous, but the Lord never confirmed that promise by an oath until his faith was put to the test—until he tried him, and this he did by commanding him to offer his beloved Isaac as a sacrifice upon the altar. And when Abraham had virtually obeyed that command, God confirmed the promise, and said that it was because he had done this, and had not withheld his son, that he would thus bless him.

This is precisely what the apostle James teaches—that is, that Abraham's faith was made perfect by works, and that the scripture which says, Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness, was fulfilled when he had offered his son Isaac on the altar. How beautifully this agrees with and illustrates the gospel system of justification. 1st, The word or promise of God. 2d, Faith in that word. 3d, Obedience growing out of that faith. 4th, Justification. 5th, Rejoicing in hope of the glory of God.

But let us hear Paul once more: "By faith, Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and he that had received

the promises offered up his only begotten son, of whom it is said, in Isaac shall thy seed be called, accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead." Heb. xi, 17, etc. Here Paul declares that Abraham offered his son by faith; but was it by *faith alone?* No. But faith influenced him to obey the command which required this offering, and this was done to try his faith. And never was any man's faith put to a more severe test. God had promised Abraham that in his seed should all the families of the earth be blessed, and told him that in Isaac his seed should be counted. Gen. xxi, 12. In Isaac, then, was the only hope of the fulfillment of this promise. But God commands him to slay his son Isaac, and offer him on an altar as a sacrifice. Here the promise and command seemed to clash. Abraham might have reasoned thus: if I obey this command, the promise of God must fail; but if I do not obey, I shall be condemned as a transgressor. What shall I do? And then to slay my beloved son Isaac—how can I bear the thought. All the tender feelings of my heart twine around this son. I love him affectionately; O, how can I slay him! But he staggered not between the promise and command. He believed God's promise would be fulfilled if he obeyed him, "accounting that God was able to raise him from the dead," and from the moldering ashes upon Mount Moriah's altar, bring forth the living Isaac again, and through him fulfill all the promises made to his father Abraham. Hence he prepared the altar, "and laid the wood in order upon it, and bound his son Isaac, and laid him on the altar, upon the wood. And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son. And the angel of the Lord called to Abraham out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham. And he said, Here am I. And he said, Lay not thy hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him, for now I know that thou fearest

God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me." Gen. xxii, 9, etc. All this Paul declares was done by faith, and that here God put an end to all strife concerning his promise, by confirming it with an oath. And James says that this is the time when the scripture was fulfilled which says, "Abraham believed God and it was imputed to him for righteousness." Thus are these two apostles reconciled, and the doctrine of justification in obedience produced by faith fully established.

But now let us ask the apostle Paul direct: Do you intend to teach that, under the gospel of Christ, we must perform any act of obedience in order to be justified? *Answer*—"God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. vi, 17, 18. Let it be remembered that this language is found in connection with Paul's teaching on the subject of justification which we have been considering, and is a continuation of the same subject. It would seem that Paul supposed that from what he had said about justification without works, the works of the law, the Jews would say, Then we may continue in sin that grace may abound, and that we are at liberty to sin, because we are not under the law but under grace, and that justification may now be obtained by faith, without any obedience whatever. But the apostle says, God forbid that I should teach such doctrine, and refers them to the time when all Christians were made free from sin, and reminds them of the fact that this blessing was obtained when they obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine which was delivered them.

I will close my remarks on this point with the words of the apostle Peter, addressed to those who have been justified according to the gospel of Christ: "Seeing ye have

purified your souls in obeying the truth through the spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart, fervently." O! let all those who have embraced the gospel, and manifested their faith in God by obeying the form of doctrine delivered in his word, be careful to maintain good works, that they who speak against you as evil doers, may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.

Having seen that when persons were justified by faith, in the days of the apostles, they obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered them, we will now endeavor to show what that form of doctrine is. We would first suggest that doctrine can not be obeyed—doctrine is to be believed, and commandments are to be obeyed. Again, the form of any thing is not the thing itself, but a representation of it. The likeness of General Washington, which the reader may have in his room, is not General Washington, but the form, or representation of him. So, the form of doctrine, in obedience to which persons are justified, is a representation of the doctrine, and as there can be no obedience where there is no command, this form of doctrine must be composed of a class of commands which represent the doctrine.

Now, if we can ascertain what the doctrine is, we will be better prepared to understand its form. The leading, all-important, and fundamental points in the gospel of Christ, or Christian doctrine, are summed up by Paul thus: "How that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures." 1 Cor. xv, 3, 4. In this doctrine, which the apostle calls the gospel, there are three points: 1. Christ died for sin. 2. He was buried 3. He rose again.

Now, I ask every Bible student to point out three commands that will represent or shew forth these facts. Will *faith alone* do it? When faith in these facts kills the love of sin in the believer's heart, it may show forth the death of Christ; but two facts in the doctrine remain unrepresented. There must then be in this form of doctrine, some command, by obeying which, the believer shows forth the burial and resurrection of our blessed Lord. But let us hear Paul himself upon this subject, in the same chapter where he mentions the form of doctrine.

"What shall we say, then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Rom. vi, 1, 2. Here is the first point in the form of doctrine. The first item in the doctrine is, Christ died for sin; the first item in the form of doctrine is, that we die to sin. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are (or were, to continue the same tense), buried with him, by baptism, into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." V. 3, 4.

In this form is represented the death of Christ, in our death to sin; his burial in our immersion, and his resurrection in our rising from the watery grave, to walk in newness of life. This, then, must be the form of doctrine which persons obeyed when they were made free from sin, under the immediate teaching of the inspired apostles of the Lamb. Hence Paul goes on to say, "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." V. 5.

With this view agrees the teaching of Christ and his holy apostles. Christ commanded his witnesses to go and preach the gospel to every creature, assuring them that

"he who believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark xvi, 16. Hence, when Peter announced this form of doctrine to the heart-smitten multitude, who inquired of him what they must do to be justified, he said, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts ii, 38. This too, accounts for the language of Ananias to Saul, who was anxiously seeking this justification: "Why tarriest thou?" said he; "arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xxii, 16.

To the same effect speaks this same Saul, afterward called Paul, when he says, "According to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. iii, 5. That the washing of regeneration here spoken of, is baptism, we have the testimony of Dr. A. Clarke, and James McKnight, D. D., the former a distinguished commentator of the Methodist Episcopal Church—the latter, an unsurpassed translator and commentary writer of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Clarke says, on this washing: "Undoubtedly, the apostle here means *baptism*, the rite by which persons were admitted into the church, and the *visible sign* of the cleansing, purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, which the apostle immediately subjoins. Baptism is only a *sign*, and therefore should never be separated from the thing signified—but it is a *rite* commanded by God himself, and therefore, the thing signified should never be expected without it." That is, if we understand the doctor correctly, the cleansing influence of the Holy Spirit should never be expected, without baptism.

McKnight says: "Through the bath of regeneration—through baptism, called the bath of regeneration, not because any change in the nature of the baptized person, is

produced by baptism—but because it is an emblem of the purification of the soul from sin." Thus does this great scholar and critic teach that this washing, which he renders bath—this rendering being more in accordance with the original—is baptism. It is strange, however, that he, with so many others, should call baptism "an emblem of the purification of the soul from sin," and a "sign of the purifying influence of the Holy Spirit," when nothing of this kind is found in the whole New Testament.

Baptism is never called a sign of regeneration, nor an emblem of the Spirit's influence, by any apostle of Christ whose writings have come down to us. But those who thus teach, must account to the great head of the church for it.

Now, of the things which we have written, this is the sum:—God has loved the world, and sent his Son to die for sinners; Christ has manifested that love by all he did and suffered for us; faith in God's love thus manifested, slays the enmity of the heart, so that by faith the sinner dies to the love and practice of sin—his faith in God's promises, influences him to reform and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins—and when he thus obeys from the heart this form of doctrine, he is made free from sin, and becomes a servant of righteousness.

In conclusion, let me say to all who have thus been justified by faith, be faithful in the discharge of all the holy obligations of Christianity, that you may finally enter into that rest that remains for the people of God. May the great Lord of all enable us all so to live, that we may enjoy his favor in life, his loving kindness in death, and his holy presence in eternity. Amen.

SERMON VII.

SANCTIFICATION.

For this is the will of God, even your sanctification.
THESS. iv 3.

I HAVE selected the above text, for the purpose of introducing the subject of sanctification as the theme of this discourse. I need not inform the reader that this is a subject of vast importance to all who desire to enjoy the approbation of the heavenly Father. Every student of the Bible knows that without sanctification, no person shall ever enjoy the favor of God, either in time or eternity.

Different views, however, have been taken of this subject. Some have been understood to teach that by sanctification is meant a state of entire holiness—a state in which the subject of it has got out of the reach of temptation—having become so pure that no evil desires could arise in the mind, or if they did, the purity of the heart was such that they had no influence ; the sanctified having, as it used to be expressed, got out of *gun-shot* of the devil.

Others, as if alarmed at this idea, have been understood to deny the doctrine of sanctification altogether. Some have gone so far in this direction as to say that they commit sin every day, and hour, and minute—in word, thought and deed. Now, it seems to me that Satan himself could not do worse than that.

I suppose, in this case, as in all other cases, the truth

lies between these extremes. That the doctrine of sanctification is a Bible doctrine, is certain. Both Testaments abound with testimony in its favor. Our text is to the point, for it declares that it is God's will that his people be sanctified.

Now, we desire, in this discourse, to give this subject a careful and scriptural investigation, that we may know the truth, as it is in Jesus—in doing which I propose to examine the subject in the following order:

I. Endeavor to ascertain what is meant by sanctification, according to the Bible.

II. Notice the means of sanctification.

III. Notice the necessity of sanctification.

I. According to this order, then, we inquire, first of all, What does this word *sanctification* mean?

The English word sanctification is defined to mean "the act of making holy; 2, the act of consecrating, or of setting apart for a sacred purpose; consecration."—*Webster.* The Greek word which is here rendered sanctification is *hagiasmos*, which occurs ten times in the New Testament, and is translated in the king's version of the Holy Scriptures, holiness, five times, and sanctification five times. Greenfield defines this term thus: "sanctification, sanctity." He also defines *hagazō*, from which *hagiasmos* is derived, to mean, "to separate, consecrate, cleanse, purify, sanctify; regard, or reverence as holy."

From all, then, that we can gather from Greek and English lexicographers, to sanctify means,

1. To set apart, separate, or appoint to a holy, sacred or religious use.

2. To cleanse, purify, or make holy.

We shall then consider the subject in this discourse under these two ideas, or in the light of these two definitions.

1. The term sanctification is used in the first signification

in the following scripture: "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." Gen. ii, 3. Now, all that could be meant by this term, as employed in this passage, is, that the seventh day was set apart to a holy or religious use. The sun rose and set on this day, as on all other days; clouds gathered, winds blew, and storms roared on this day, the same after it was sanctified as before; no physical difference could be seen between this day and all other days. And yet it is called a *holy day*, a *sanctified day*. The meaning is, that God separated this day, in a certain sense, from all other days, and consecrated it to a holy and pious use.

The term is also used in this sense in Ex. xiii, 1, 2: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Sanctify unto me all the first born, among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast; it is mine." Here sanctification can only mean to set apart to a religious use. The first born of Israel, according to this law, were to serve as priests, to teach the people in sacred things, to offer their sacrifices, and make atonement for their sins, until God accepted the tribe of Levi in the stead of the first born. See Numbers iii, 6–12.

When Moses had built the altar of burnt offerings, the Lord commanded him to "sanctify it." Ex. xxix, 37. Indeed, all the furniture of the House of God was sanctified. The robes of the priests, the cups, bowls, tables, and even the snuffers and tongs, all, all were sanctified, according to the law of Moses. But in all these examples, sanctification means to set apart to a religious use. No difference was made in the appearance of the altar by its sanctification. It was still a rough heap of unhewn stones. So of all the vessels of the sanctuary, the sacerdotal robes, etc., etc.—they remained *physically* the same, though *religiously* they were regarded as holy, or sanctified, because set apart to religious purposes.

According to this law, a man might sanctify his field, or any part thereof; and when sanctified, all it produced was to be the Lord's, and went to sustain the Lord's cause and worship. And if he afterwards desired to redeem it, or release it from the obligations of this sanctification, the law said, "He shall add a fifth part of the money of thy estimation, and it shall be assured unto him." Lev. xxvii, 16. That is, if a man, who had sanctified any portion of his field, desired to release it from that devoted state, he was to add to it the fifth of the estimate which the priests had put upon it; and that estimate was made according to the produce thereof. Say, the field produced fifty bushels of barley, and that was worth fifty dollars, then he must add one-fifth, which would be ten dollars, making sixty in all, that he would have to pay. This went into the Lord's treasure, and the field returned to the former owner. But, I have only referred to this as another example of the first use of the word sanctification.

The term is sometimes used in this sense in the New Testament. I presume it has this signification in 2 Cor. vi, 11. In this connection, the apostle names a great number of crimes, saying, that those who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" "and," said he, "such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified," etc. Here Paul doubtless means that, though some of the members of this church had once been guilty of these dark crimes, they were now separated, and set apart to a religious use, to a holy purpose, even to "glorify God in their bodies and spirits which are his." This would be a strong inducement to influence them to avoid these evil deeds of which they had formerly been guilty, and to prompt them to practice holiness in the fear of God.

The term *sanctified* seems to be used in 1 Cor. vii, 14, as simply meaning to set apart to a certain use for which

it is suited. Paul says: "For the infidel husband is sanctified *to* the wife, and the infidel wife is santified *to* the believing husband; otherwise, certainly, your children were unclean; *whereas, indeed,* they are holy." [McKnight's translation.] Upon this text, Dr. McKnight makes the following just remarks: "I therefore, with Elsner, think that the words (sanctified and unclean) in this verse have neither a federal nor moral meaning, but are used in the idiom of the Hebrews, who by *sanctified* understood what was fitted for a particular use; and by *unclean,* what was unfit for use, and thereforefore to be cast away."

"The terms in the verse, thus understood, afford a rational meaning, namely: that when infidels are married to Christians, if they have a strong affection for their Christian spouses, they are thereby *sanctified* to them—they are fitted to continue married to them, because their affection to the Christian party will insure to that party the faithful performance of every duty; and that if the marriages of Christians and infidels were to be dissolved, they would cast away their children as unclean—that is, losing their affection for them, they would expose them after the barbarous customs of the Greeks, or at least neglect their education; but that by continuing their marriage they are holy—they are preserved as sacred pledges of their mutual love, and educated with care."

This explanation not only shows that the word sanctification here simply means set apart to a suitable purpose, but it also throws some light upon a passage of scripture which has been regarded as difficult to be understood.

2. But the term *sanctification* is used in its second or higher sense in the following scriptures: The Lord, speaking by his prophet, in reference to the restoration of the children of Israel to the land of their fathers, says, "My tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their

God, and they shall be my people; and the heathen shall know that I, the Lord, do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forever." Ez. xxxvii, 27, 28.

The sanctification here named is more than merely setting apart to a religious use; it means to make pure, clean or holy. Its effects were to be so visible that even the heathen should see it, and be constrained to acknowledge that it was the work of God.

Paul uses the term in this higher sense in 2 Tim. ii, 21: "If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, *sanctified*, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work." In this sense, it is equivalent to *holiness*—indeed it is the same word which, in many places, is translated holiness, in the common version of the scriptures. Paul says: "As ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness, and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness;"—*hagiasmos*, sanctification. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness (*hagiasmos*), without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. xii, 14.

It is hard to explain this state of mind and heart in words. That the term sanctify means to cleanse, to purify, to make holy, is easy to say—but to fully comprehend all that is meant by these *explaining* words, may not be quite so easy. Still, we may be able to understand the effects of sanctification; and perhaps this is the better way to treat the subject, so as to enable us to learn the state of our own heart. This, Christian reader, should be the grand object of all our investigations on religious subjects. It should be to learn God's will, and the state of our own hearts and lives in reference to that will. The following items, then, may be taken as evidence of sanctification, in the sense of purity or holiness:

1. *Reverence for sacred things.* The sanctified heart feels a reverence for the law of God—for the ordinance of the Lord—for the house and worship of God. He whose heart is thus purified does not pronounce the name of God in a light and trivial manner—he does not use the name of the Lord as a common by-word; he feels deep reverence for the Holy One of Israel, and pronounces his name with awe. When he comes into the house of worship, he does not come in with a light, careless air, as if he were going into a theater or ball-room; but he comes with feelings of reverence for those devotional exercises which are being performed in the name of the Lord Jesus.

When I see a member of the church come into the house of worship with a vain air, and a giddy smile, take his seat, and commence gazing around to see who is there, perhaps making significant winks and gestures, I always think there is some corner of that man's heart that is not sanctified. The person, whether male or female, old or young, who feels the purifying influence of God's grace, is not likely to act in this careless, thoughtless manner in the house where congregational devotions are offered up to the great God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

2. *Earnest desire* for the glory of God, the peace and prosperity of the church, and for the salvation of the world, may be regarded as another evidence of sanctification, in its Bible sense. This man's feelings and desires are identified with the church; he loves to meet with the people of God; he mourns when the cause of Christ languishes, and he rejoices when it prospers. He feels an anxious desire to be more and still more like the Saviour; he desires to have the mind that was in Christ—that humble, gentle, long-suffering disposition, which characterized the blessed Saviour.

3. *Patience* may be considered as another evidence of

purity of heart. That man who is impatient, peevish, discontented—always complaining of the weather, the seasons, the people, etc., etc.—betrays an unholy state of mind. The man whose heart is right with God endeavors to resign himself to all the dispensations of Divine Providence. He "provides against the worst, and hopes for the best."

4. *Hatred for sin* is another mark of the sanctified heart. This man "rejoices not in iniquity, but in the truth." He hates sin, because it is sin—because it is displeasing to God, and ruinous to man. If he should, in an unguarded moment, do that which is wrong, he hates the act, is sorry for it, and resolves to do so no more. He delights in no act, no pursuit, no amusement, no exercise, that he has reason to believe is displeasing to the Heavenly Father; but he feels disposed to endeavor to shun the very appearance of evil.

5. *Delight in the law of God* is also a strong evidence of sanctification. The man who is sanctified, according to the second meaning which we have put upon that word, takes great delight in reading or hearing the word of the Lord. He loves the Lord supremely, and the people of God devoutly. Hence, he has great delight in keeping the commandments of the Lord, and in meeting with the Lord's people in the Lord's house, especially on the Lord's day. Here he repairs for real enjoyment. He can truly say, "I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness." And when assembled with the Lord's people, he hears the name of God revered, his word read, and the singing of the songs of Zion; and he sits around the table of the Lord, and commemorates the dying love of Christ in the emblematic loaf and cup; he feels like saying:

"My willing soul would stay
In such a frame as this,
And sit, and sing herself away,
To everlasting bliss."

6. *Devotion to the cause of Christ* may be regarded as another evidence of a pure or sanctified heart. The man whose heart has been brought under the purifying influence of the gospel of Christ, feels willing to labor and sacrifice for that holy cause which cost Messiah's life. He is willing to do all he can for the prosperity of the church, the glory of God, and the salvation of sinners. If he is capable of doing good in proclaiming the glad tidings, he is ready and willing to bear his part in that blessed work. Or, if money is necessary to sustain the cause, to meet the contingent expenses of the congregation, or to sustain the preaching of the gospel, he is ever ready to contribute, according to his ability, to so good a cause. And what he does for this holy cause, he does willingly, knowing that "God loves a cheerful giver."

Now, Christian reader, where these feelings, desires, emotions and actions abound in the heart and life of any person, that person is regarded, in the light of the Bible, as sanctified.

II. But, according to the order proposed, we will now proceed to notice some of the means of sanctification. Sanctification, in its first signification—that is, in the sense of setting apart—has almost always been performed by some religious rite or ceremony. The ceremony by which Aaron and his sons were sanctified, was quite lengthy. They were to be sprinkled with blood, washed in water, and anointed with holy or sanctified oil. A full account of the whole ceremony, the reader will find in the twenty-ninth chapter of Exodus. The ceremony, too, by which

the altar was sanctified, had many items. Seven days were occupied in its performance. The law reads thus: "And thou shalt offer every day a bullock for sin offering, for atonement; and thou shalt cleanse the altar, when thou hast made an atonement for it, and thou shalt anoint it to sanctify it." Ex. xxix, 36. "And thou shalt anoint the altar of the burnt-offerings, and all his vessels, and sanctify the altar; and it shall be an altar most holy." Ex. xl, 10. Thus were persons, altars, vestments, and vessels sanctified by some legal ceremony under the Old Testament.

Persons, only, are sanctified under the New Testament, and this is done by a rite, or religious ordinance. Hence, the apostle said to the Corinthians: "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of our Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God." 1 Cor. vi, 11. As already stated, sanctification is used here in the sense of setting apart to a religious use, and the rite by which these persons were thus sanctified, is called a *washing*. The same ordinance of consecration is named by Paul, in Ephesians v, 26: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the *washing of water* by the word. The same washing is referred to again, in Hebrews x, 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies *washed* with pure water."

By saying *pure water*, the apostle shows that this washing is not a Jewish rite, or a sanctification performed according to the law of Moses. The water of purification, under that law, was itself sanctified by a legal process, a part of which was the sprinkling of the ashes of a red heifer in the water. But in this New Testament sanctification, there are to be no such mixtures. Pure water—that is, just

simply water—is to be used. It is worthy of remark, also, that this washing has to do with the body. The heart is, figuratively, sprinkled with the blood of Christ. This is done by faith in that blood; but over and above this sprinkling of the heart, Paul says, the *body* was washed, and that, too, with water. Notice, he does not say a part of the body, or one member of the body—the foot, the hand, or the head—but he says, the *body*. On another occasion, speaking on another subject, the same apostle says: "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ." 1 Cor. xii, 12. Thus, according to Paul's reasoning, it takes all the members to make the one body; hence, when he says, "having the body washed with pure water," he teaches that the whole body, the entire person, was brought under the influence of this washing, by which they were sanctified, consecrated, and set apart to the service of the living God. The same washing is called the *washing of regeneration*, in Titus iii, 5.

But the question now arises, What is meant by this washing? Heb. x, 23. Dr. McKnight paraphrases thus: "*And being washed in body with* the *clean water* of *baptism*, whereby we professed our faith in Christ as our only High Priest, *let us hold fast the confession of our hope* of salvation through his ministration," etc. Then, according to this learned and pious doctor of divinity, of the Presbyterian faith, the washing here referred to, is CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

On Ephesians v, 26, he also says, "*that he might sanctify her* (the church), and fit her for becoming his spouse; *having cleansed her*, emblematically, by baptism, as brides are wont to be cleansed, *with a bath of water and with the word*, from your superstitions of Judaism and heathenism." On 1 Corinthians vi, 11, he says, "*You are washed*

with the water of baptism, in token of your having vowed to lead a new life." Thus, the reader will see that, according to Dr. McKnight, all these scriptures refer to baptism.

Let us hear one more doctor of divinity on the subject. Dr. A. Clarke, on 1 Corinthians vi, 11, has the following note: "*Ye are washed;* ye have been *baptized* into the Christian faith; and ye have promised, in this baptism, to put off all filthiness of the flesh and spirit; and the *washing* of your bodies is emblematical of the purification of your souls." On Ephesians v, 26, Dr. Clarke says: "*With the washing of water*, baptism, accompanied with the purifying influence of the Holy Spirit." On Titus iii, 5, he also says: "Undoubtedly, the apostle here means baptism, the rite by which persons were admitted into the church," etc.

Now I fully agree with these doctors, that the washing referred to in these scriptures, is baptism. All persons who are thus washed, or baptized, upon a profession of their faith in Christ, are regarded, in the light of the New Testament, as sanctified, according to the first meaning which we have given to the word sanctification. John Wesley attempts to change the order of the items, as they stand in 1 Corinthians v, 11, so as to make justification come before sanctification, according to his favorite theory upon that subject. But he need not to have done this, had he considered that the term *sanctified* is here used in the sense of *setting apart* to a religious use. In this sense, persons are always sanctified before they are justified, according to apostolic practice and teaching. That is to say, they are baptized, in order to justification; or they are set apart to the service of God, in baptism, for the remission of sins.

Then, let all who have been baptized according to the

gospel of Jesus Christ, remember that they are *devoted;* that they have been solemnly consecrated, sanctified, or set apart, to a pious, religious use; even to the service of the holy and pure God. O, then, what manner of persons ought those to be, who have been thus given up to God? Reader, have you been thus devoted to the Lord? Then, never forget the solemnities of that scene, nor the obligagations that rest upon you in consideration thereof.

But let us proceed to consider the means of sanctification in its second sense; the sense of being pure, or holy.

And I here affirm, that, to sanctify, in this sense, is the work of God; none but God can purify the heart, can cleanse the soul from all its impurities, and thus render the heart a fit temple for the Holy spirit to dwell in. Then, Christian reader, if you have been consecrated to God in baptism, and desire to be more pure, more holy, more like the blessed Saviour, go to God, for He alone can perform this great work.

But now the question is stated, how does God do it? Does He sanctify with means, or without means? And is the work instantaneous, or progressive? Is it performed in a moment, or does it require time for its completion?

I was taught in early life, to believe that sanctification was as much above justification, as justification is above a state of nature; and that, although persons might be justified, or pardoned of all past sins, yet they were not prepared to meet God in peace, until they reached this higher state, which my teachers called sanctification. And they taught me moreover, that this was an instantaneous work—that it was performed in the twinkling of an eye; and that when persons became subjects of it, they would be as sensible of the fact, as they could be of any sensible act that might be performed upon the body.

Under the influence of this system, I have seen members

of their church, yes, shouting members, come to the anxious seat, at the invitation of the preacher, seeking for sanctification. I have known them to remain there for a great length of time, apparently in great distress of mind, and deep agony of soul, praying and beseeching the Lord to come right then and sanctify them! But, though I have seen many persons who professed sanctification in this sense, I never saw any one obtain it. But, notwithstanding the same doctrine is still to be found in the standard works of that church from which I received my *early* religious instructions, I have not witnessed a scene like the one just described, for many years. I think they are learning the way of the Lord on this subject, more perfectly.

Now, I must say, with due deference to the feelings and practices of good men, that in the theory and practice above alluded to, there is more of superstition and fanaticism than of scriptural piety and godliness. I can see nothing in all the book of God to sanction any such theory or practice. God has always employed visible means for the sanctification of man as well as for his conversion; some of which, I now proceed to name.

1. *The word of God.* Jesus prayed to his heavenly Father, in behalf of his disciples, saying: "*sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.*" Thus, the Lord prayed for the sanctification of his disciples, and he prayed the Father to do the work; but he did not ask him to come right down from heaven, and by some miraculous power, sanctify them in a moment; but he prayed the Father to perform this blessed work by means; through the *word of truth.* The apostle Peter doubtless refers to the same divine arrangement when he says, "Whereby are given unto us, exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature," 2 Pet. i, 4. Now, to be made a partaker of the divine nature, is to be

sanctified; those who partake of all that is meant in this scripture, by the *divine nature*, are as fully sanctified as human nature can be. And the apostle here teaches that the divine nature is to be obtained through the exceeding great and precious promises which the divine power hath given in the gospel of God's grace to fallen humanity.

Paul to the Corinthians, teaches the same doctrine. He says: "We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. iii, 18.

Here, the apostle represents the gospel as a mirror, in which is portrayed the most beautiful and lovely moral image that was ever gazed upon by men or angels; the lovely image of the Lord Jesus Christ. And now, by looking at that image steadfastly, by faith, the believer catches the divine likeness, and is thus changed into the same image, until, in his moral character, he resembles the blessed Saviour. Truly this is to be sanctified. This is to have the mind of Christ. But this mind or likeness is to be obtained, by "*beholding as in a glass*, the glory of the Lord."

This is a kind of spiritual daguerreotyping. Now, in this art, several things are necessary in order to get a good likeness. The person must be placed at a proper distance from the instrument. Then he must have the proper position, and there must be the proper amount of light, and he must remain there a proper length of time; and I believe that *sky-light* is always said to be the best.

Now let the plate upon which the likeness is taken, represent the believer's heart; let the instrument represent the moral image of Christ as revealed in the gospel. Then in order to get that image transcribed upon the heart, the believer must come near to the Lord, as he stands portrayed in the glass of the gospel. He must not keep at too great a distance, for in that way the likeness will never be well

taken. Then he must remain there the proper time; he must look, or contemplate with intense desire upon the lovely image as it is presented in the gospel. A person never would get a good likeness, according to the natural science of which we now speak, if he should, while before the instrument, cast his eye upon it for a second, and then commence gazing upon other objects, turning his eye occasionally upon the instrument, just as he was searching for some new object. No, he must be still and look steadily, until the impression is fairly taken.

So in this spiritual arrangement. A person will never catch the divine likeness so as to be changed into the same image, by looking at the Saviour only occasionally; reading a chapter in the New Testament, perhaps once a week, or a month, and then not thinking about it any longer than he is reading it, but looking off upon the world, employing all his time and attention with the affairs of earth. In this way he will soon become an epistle of the world, known and read of all men.

And in Daguerreotyping, nothing must stand between the plate and the person whose likeness is being taken. So, in this divine arrangement. You must not let the *almighty* dollar get between you and the image of Christ, if you would obtain his likeness. As you run with patience the race set before you, you must LOOK TO JESUS, and live under the light of the gospel; let this *sky-light*, with all its divine influence, blaze upon your heart, meditating upon the character of Christ—upon his sufferings for us poor sinners, and you will catch his likeness, until you are "changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

2. But I will name, as a second means of sanctification, the ordinances of the Lord's house. These have a powerful influence in purifying the heart, and in keeping it pure.

And hence, the person who but seldom attends the house of worship, but is always busying himself about the affairs of this life, is not apt to be very devotional—not very heavenly-minded; he does not exhibit many of the evidences of a pure and holy heart. But that person who is regular and constant in his attendance in the Lord's house, not only in body, but in mind, worshiping God in *spirit* and in *truth*, drinks into the mind of Christ, until he exhibits the evidences of sanctification which we have just pointed out.

Among these ordinances are, singing, prayer, preaching the word, exhortation, and the Lord's Supper, which brings before the contemplating mind the sorrowful, suffering scenes through which the great Redeemer passed to save our fallen race. These ordinances, properly attended to, are all designed and well calculated to sanctify our nature, and bring all the powers of the mind into captivity to the law of Christ.

In a word, the whole work of evangelical or gospel sanctification is performed on the principle of assimilation. The mind of God and the mind of man, in this work, assimilate. The awful circumstance which ruined our world was, that the heart of man *got out of beat.* It ceased to beat in harmony with the will of God. And the whole gospel scheme is a great regulator, intended to correct the human heart, until it shall pulsate in harmony with the divine will.

Now, in order to this, the mind of God and the mind of man must be brought in contact. That this may be done, God has revealed his mind in the Bible, and set it *personally* before our world in the person and character of Jesus Christ. Now, our minds and thoughts are, through this means, to be brought into close connection with the mind of God, until all our impurities are purged away, and we become sanctified and meet for the Master's use. And all

the ordinances I have named, or that are enjoined in the gospel, are only so many means designed to keep the mind of God and the image of Christ before our minds, that we may still enjoy the hallowed influence of God's grace. For it is not only necessary that we be purified, but it is important that we remain pure; for "pure religion, and undefiled before God and the Father," not only requires that we should take care of widows and orphans, in their afflictions, but that we "keep ourselves unspotted by the world;" hence, said Paul to Timothy, "KEEP THYSELF PURE."

III. I will now offer a few reasons why we should all strive to obtain and retain the state of mind and heart which we have now described, and then close this discourse.

1. *It is the will of God;* "for this is the will of God, even our sanctification." This should be reason enough to induce every child of man to use all the means of grace that God has ordained, in order to attain unto that state of mind that will be well pleasing in his sight. We may also know that this is for our well-being, for his whole will in reference to man is for our good, for our happiness in time and in eternity.

2. *To prepare us for usefulness.* The purer we are, the more useful we can be. And this is what we should all live for. No man should live for himself alone. Paul says that "Christ died for us, and rose again, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for us and rose again." You will always notice that the most useful persons in the service of God, are the most pure in heart. Hence, the apostle says: "if a man, therefore, purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, *sanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work.*" 2 Tim. ii, 21. Then,

by being thus sanctified, we are prepared to "serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear."

3. *To qualify us for the fellowship of saints, here and hereafter.*

There is much said in the religious world on the subject of Christian fellowship. Many ways and means are devised by man to obtain it, and many human laws and human devices are formed for the purpose of keeping it. But all these often prove to be mere ropes of sand. They break like the withes with which Sampson was bound. No human laws nor human means can hold in holy union those whose hearts are impure—whose affections are all defiled with sin. Poor, selfish human nature will rise above mere human authority.

Evangelical sanctification is God's instrument or means of Christian fellowship. Hearts thus purified by the holy means to which we have referred under the foregoing head of this discourse, will harmonize; they will, "like kindred drops, mingle into one." Hence, I would advise, in all cases where a want of Christian fellowship exists, either in a church generally, or among individuals, that all concerned seek the Lord, in the ordinances of his house; and that each one endeavor to get his own heart purified, and then fellowship can soon be obtained.

4. *That we may see God in peace.* We name this as the most important reason why we should labor to obtain that state of purity which the gospel requires. The apostle enjoins it upon the disciples of Christ, to "follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which," he says, "no man shall see the Lord." But Jesus says: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." How careful, then, should we be to "purify ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

5. *That we may be prepared to enter into the City of God at last*, and to enjoy the society of the pure and holy that dwell therein. The reader will find a very graphic description of this holy city in the twenty-first chapter of the "Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him," at the conclusion of which he will find this solemn declaration: "And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they who are written in the Lamb's book of life."

May the Almighty Father have mercy on us all, and enable the writer, and the reader, to keep themselves unspotted by the world, and prepare us all for that Holy City. Amen.

SERMON VIII.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.
1 Cor. ii, 10.

For the purpose of bringing this subject fairly before your minds, I will read a few scriptures, in addition to the text:

"If you love me keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the spirit of truth whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. ⁂ ⁂ ⁂ These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father shall send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and shall bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."—John xiv, 15, 16, 17—25, 26.

Again: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. Howbeit, when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me:

for he shall receive of mine and show it unto you." John xvi, 7–14. Before commencing our remarks, we wish to read one more scripture, found in 1 Tim. iii, 16: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels," etc. The point in this quotation to which we invite special attention is, that Christ was justified in, or by the spirit.

Now from these scriptures you perceive, my friends, that a large field of work is laid out for the Holy Spirit.

1. The Spirit was to justify Christ.

2. It was to glorify Christ.

3. It was to comfort the disciples.

4. It was to receive the things that belonged to Christ, and show them to the disciples, or apostles.

5. It was to bring all things to the remembrance of the disciples, whatsoever Christ had spoken to them.

6. It was to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.

We now ask, has the spirit accomplished all this work? and if so, how did it do it? And first of all we ask, how did the spirit justify Christ?

That we may fully understand this, we remark, that to justify does not always mean to pardon. It can not have this meaning in this passage. Christ was never guilty of any crime, and hence he could not be pardoned. But when it is said of a person who is not guilty of any crime, that he was justified, it implies that he was charged with a crime, but was justified in the thing which he has done.

Suppose, for illustration, that three men are brought before the circuit court, under indictment for murder. In reference to the first, it is clear from all the testimony in the case, that he has not taken the life of any human being. In the case of the second, it is proven to the satisfaction of all

that he has killed a man, but that he did it in self-defense; that this was the only way to save his own life. But suppose, in the case of the third, it is proven beyond doubt that he is guilty of murder in the first degree. He is therefore condemned, and the day of his execution is appointed. But now suppose that a petition is sent up to the governor, upon which a reprieve is granted. Now these three men are again returned to the bosom of society. One returns innocent, the second justified, and the third pardoned.

Now apply this to our blessed Lord. He was charged with two crimes, and brought before the highest courts on earth to answer for them. When brought before the Jewish High Priest, he was charged with blasphemy, for saying he was the Son of God. And indeed this would have been blasphemy if he was not the Son of God.

But though they had many false witnesses in attendance, they failed to establish his guilt, until, contrary to all usage, they call on him to testify in his own case. "Then the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said:" which was, according to their custom, to answer in the affirmative. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? For this blasphemy, it was decided that he should be put to death. But then, the Jews no longer have the power to take life, and hence his cause must be taken before the Roman authorities. For the purpose of obtaining a verdict of death against him, he is now brought before Pilate's bar. But now a new charge must be brought up. It matters not to Pilate whether he said he was the Son of the Jews' God or not. Hence they now charge him with treason, in that he said he was the king of the Jews. This had a bearing on Cæsar's authority, and hence this would gain him a

hearing before Pilate's tribunal. "Pilate therefore said unto him, art thou a king? Jesus answered, thou sayest I am a king. To this end was I born." John xviii, 37. Pilate, still fearing to condemn Jesus, sought to release him. But the Jews cried out, saying, if thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend. This had the desired effect. Fearing that he should be turned out of office, he gave the sentence of death against the Lord Messiah. Thus was Christ condemned, and put to death for blasphemy and high treason.

Now in order to justify Christ, it must be proven that he was all that he professed to be. This no man could do. Hence the Holy Spirit undertakes his cause, and proposes to justify him, in all his pretensions, before an intelligent universe.

In order to accomplish this glorious work, the Holy Spirit raised our Lord and Saviour from the dead; hence Peter says, "He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit." 1 Pet. iii, 18. After his resurrection, he appeared to his disciples occasionally, for forty days, teaching them things concerning his kingdom. At his last personal interview with them, he commanded them to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, "but," said he, "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." As if he had said, all power in heaven and earth is given unto me; go therefore, and offer salvation to all men in my name; but wait until I am justified by the spirit. I have been condemned and crucified for blasphemy and high treason; my name stands upon the records of the highest ecclessiastical and civil courts upon the earth, as a malefactor; and now should you offer salvation to a wicked world, in my name, no one will accept it. Even those who might desire to obtain the favor of God would reproach you with mocking their miseries, by offering them pardon in the name of him who had died for blasphemy on

the Roman cross. But the Holy Spirit has undertaken my cause; he will yet justify me before an intelligent universe; and now I command you to tarry in Jerusalem until he shall have accomplished this work, and then you can, with all confidence, go and speak all the words of this life in my name. Tarry therefore, and utter not a word upon this subject until you are endued with the Spirit's power in evidence of my justification.

"When he had spoken these things, while they beheld he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight."

"Then returned they to Jerusalem from the Mount of Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath day's journey. And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter and James," and all the apostles, with certain others.

"And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as a rushing mighty wind, and filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance." Thus did the Holy Spirit commence the justification of Christ. A more favorable opportunity for defending the claims of the crucified Nazarene before all men, could not have been obtained. At this time there were Jews, devout men dwelling at Jerusalem, out of every nation under heaven, so that the transactions of this day must soon have been known throughout the whole world.

When an account of the mighty endowments of the Holy Spirit, bestowed upon the witnesses of the blessed Saviour, was noised abroad in the city, "the multitudes came together

and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language." "Others," less serious, "mocking, said they were full of new wine. But Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and said unto them, ye men of Judea and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken unto my words; for these are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." This would lead them to inquire more particularly into the cause which had produced these marvelous effects. The attention of all being thus gained, the apostle proceeded: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, and it shall come to pass in the last days, (saith God), I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh." This prophecy God hath now fulfilled in your presence, in defense of the claims of his only begotten Son.

He then charged upon them the death of the innocent Jesus, saying that they with wicked hands had crucified and slain him. "But," he continues, "this Jesus has God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." As if he had said, these mighty gifts and miraculous powers are imparted to us by the spirit of the living God, in proof of the innocency of that holy person "whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Thus, "by signs and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit," was our blessed Lord justified in saying he was the Son of God and King of Zion. And thus did the Holy Spirit glorify our Redeemer. For as soon as Christ was justified in all his pretensions, that moment was he glorified, or honored in heaven and on the earth. At the same time did the

Spirit impart comfort to the disciples. They could now "stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God."

The Spirit now brought all things which Christ had told his apostles fresh to their memory, so that they were now enabled to teach these things to others infallibly. The Spirit also revealed things belonging to the reign of Messiah to the witnesses of Christ, which he had not told them in person. Hence Paul declares, that the Holy Spirit had revealed to the apostles and prophets things which had been kept secret from the beginning of the world. See Eph., 3d ch.

But the Saviour promised that the Spirit should reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. All this was accomplished when Christ was justified.

You will perceive, my friends, that the Lord did not say that the Spirit would reprove the world of *sins* in general, but of *sin*, having reference to one particular sin; and he tells us plainly what that sin was. He says, "of sin, because they believe not on me." Just as soon as the Holy Spirit, by its miraculous power, had proved that Jesus was the Son of the living God, that moment did the sin of unbelief in Christ appear. Thus was the world reproved for not believing on Christ.

The Spirit reproved, or convinced, the world of righteousness, which the Saviour explains thus: "*of righteousness, because I go to the Father and ye see me no more.*"

When the Spirit proved that Christ had gone to the Father, and that he was crowned Lord of all, the righteousness of all his motives, teachings and works, was made manifest, and those who had charged him with casting out demons by satanic influence, were reproved, when they saw the righteousness of Christ thus defended by superhuman power.

But, according to the promise of Christ, the Spirit was

to reprove the world of judgment. He did not say, *of judgment to come*, as it is sometimes quoted; but "of judgment, *because the prince of this world is judged.*" Now, if we can learn who is meant by the prince of this world, we shall the better understand the meaning of this judgment. This character is named under this title but twice in the New Testament. Christ said to his disciples: "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me." John xiv, 30.

We think it quite certain, that by the prince of this world, here, the Saviour meant Pilate. It was Pilate who came and said, "*I find no fault in him.*" But, as we have seen before, instigated by the multitude, he did give sentence of death against him. Now, the Spirit was to reprove all engaged in that transaction, and convince the world of the unrighteousness of Pilate's judgment.

When an appeal is taken from the circuit court to the supreme court, the court above sits in judgment upon the decisions of the court below; and if a decision made by the court below, is reversed by the supreme court, it may with much propriety be said, the lower court is judged.

Thus it occurred in the case of our blessed Lord. Judgment went against him before Pilate's bar; and now he takes his cause up to the high court of glory, assured that the Judge of all the earth will do right. The decision of Pilate was there reversed, and the Holy Spirit, as Christ's advocate, was sent down, with all its mighty power, and defended his righteous claims, by the miraculous power which attended the preaching of the Cross of Christ. Thus was the prince of this world, or those who judged Christ, judged.

Having seen how the Holy Spirit reproved the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment in the apostle's time, we

now inquire, Does not the Spirit convince the world of sin in our day?

I now affirm that it always has been, and now is, the work of the Holy Spirit to convince man of sin, and that no man ever was convinced that he was a sinner against God, but by the Spirit of God. In order to make this plain, it will be necessary to ascertain what it takes to convince a man that he has sinned against the Lord.

The apostle says that "sin is the transgression of the law." This declaration rests on the fact that the law is an exposition of God's will. Any act which is contrary to the will of God is sin; and any omission to perform a duty which God requires, is also a sin against him.

These things being so, a person must know the will of the Lord, before he can be convinced that he has sinned against him. For example, a person must know that it is contrary to the will of God for him to swear profanely, before he can be convinced that he sins in doing so. The same is true in reference to all sins.

Now, the will of God concerning our actions is a thing which belongs to him, and the apostle says: "*The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God;*" and he declares that "*the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God.*" 1 Cor. ii, 10, 11. You will then perceive, my friends, that as the Spirit alone knoweth the things of God, the Spirit alone knoweth the will of God, and therefore if man is ever taught what the will of God on any subject is, the Holy Spirit must teach him. To say that a person is convinced that he is a sinner against God, when he is wholly ignorant of God's will, is downright nonsense.

Some talk of being under conviction, but this is unmeaning. A person may be undergoing an investigation which may result in his conviction; and if it does, he would then

be convicted—that is, condemned; but it would be improper to say that he is under conviction. It would be more correct to say that he is under condemnation.

But I now proceed further, and affirm that it is also the work of the Spirit to convert sinners. By conversion, I here mean that great moral change of the heart which is contemplated in evangelical conversion.

In order to man's conversion, he must not only be convinced that he is a sinner, but he must be shown the sinfulness of sin, and its awful consequences in this world, and in the world to come. And, on the other hand, he must be taught the goodness of God, and the happy results of doing his will. It can not be supposed that the heart of any one will be so changed from the love of sin as to influence him to turn to God with full purpose of heart, unless he is brought to see the evils of transgression, and the blessedness of righteousness. But all these things belong to God. The punishment which the Lord of Hosts will inflict upon the wicked, and the rewards which he will bestow upon those who love and obey him, are all matters which belong to God, and as the spirit alone knoweth the things of God, the spirit must make them known to man in order to his conversion.

We will now turn to the word of the Lord in order to learn the manner in which the Holy Spirit makes known the things of God to the children of men. So far as we have now advanced in this investigation, we suppose there is no controversy between us and our religious neighbors; but when we come to speak of the manner in which the spirit enlightens man on the great subject of salvation, some dissent from us, and therefore we shall be very partic lar on this point, and endeavor to sustain all we say by the Scriptures, which are acknowledged by all to be infallible.

Matt. x, 19, 20: "But when they shall deliver you up, take no thought how or what you shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what you shall speak, for it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father, that speaketh in you."

This declaration was made by the Lord to his disciples in view of the persecutions to which they would be exposed after his departure from them. They were eye and ear witnesses of Christ, and for their testimony in favor of him and his cause, they would subject themselves to the malice and rage of men, who would even bring them before their councils, and scourge them in their synagogues. But the Saviour admonishes them to give themselves no uneasiness in reference to what they should answer those who should examine them, and assures them that the spirit of God would speak to the people on those occasions. But how would it speak? "*The spirit of your Father speaketh in you.*" From all this, we learn that the spirit of God is a speaking spirit; that it employs words for the purpose of communicating ideas, and that it uses man's organs of speech for this purpose.

In further illustration of this principle, we read, Acts i, 16: "Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled which the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas, who was guide to them that took Jesus."

The point in this quotation to which we invite special attention is, that when the Holy Spirit was about to make the matter herein named known to man, it used David's speaking organs, and thus spoke concerning Judas. Then, whenever we wish to learn what the Holy Spirit has said on that subject, we have only to read what David wrote; for he committed to writing what the Holy Spirit said by him.

In Acts xxviii, 25, we have a very similar expression, which reads thus: "And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after Paul had spoken one word, well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias, the prophet, unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say, hearing, ye shall hear, and shall not understand," etc.

Here, you perceive, my friends, that when the apostle quotes a scripture written by a prophet, he says that the Holy Spirit spake by the prophet.

In the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we have an account of a man who had been up to Jerusalem to worship, and was returning; and as he rode in his chariot he read the prophecy of Isaiah, but did not understand it. He was reading things which belonged to God, and as the spirit alone knoweth the things of God, it must make this matter known to man, or he will never understand it. The spirit now proposes to make the prophet's meaning known to this man; and, we ask, how did he do it? Did it reveal this matter to the eunuch in some secret, mysterious way? By some peculiar impression of mind? That the spirit could have done this, no one doubts. We are not inquiring into the spirit's power. On this subject there is no controversy; hence, we do not ask how *could* the spirit reveal this secret to the Ethiopian nobleman? but *how did it do it?* "Then the spirit said unto Philip, Go near and join thyself unto this chariot." ° ° ° ° ° "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus."

Thus you see, my dear friends, that when the Holy Spirit undertook to enlighten the mind of this man on the subject of Christianity, he sent a chosen vessel, who could speak to him face to face, in words which he could understand.

We will now introduce a scripture on the subject of resisting the Holy Spirit. Much has been said on this subject,

and many fears have been entertained by some lest they had committed this crime. The scripture, however, which we are now about to read, sets this matter in a clear light, and shows when and how we may resist the spirit of God. Acts vii, 51 : "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost. as your fathers did, so do you. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted, and they have slain them that showed before the coming of the Just One, of whom you have been the betrayers and murderers."

Thus, it will be seen, that whenever the people of ancient times resisted or set at nought the councils and commands of God, spoken by the prophets of the Lord, they resisted the Holy Spirit, for it was the Holy Spirit that spoke by these prophets; and the same was true in reference to the first witnesses of our adorable Saviour. The Comforter, which is the Spirit, brought all things to their remembrance which Christ had said unto them—and even showed other things to them, which belonged to him—and hence, to reject their words, was to reject and resist the Holy Spirit.

What were those persons doing, when Stephen applied to them the words just quoted? They were rejecting the teaching of the holy prophets and apostles, as rehearsed in their hearing by Stephen, and were in the very act of taking up stones to kill him. Well might Stephen say, "As your fathers did, so do you;" and with great truth did he say, "*Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.*"

Let us then remember, that whenever we hear or read a command found in the writings of the divinely inspired witnesses of Christ, which is applicable to us, and refuse to obey it, we resist the Holy Spirit; that is, we resist what the Holy Spirit hath spoken.

Once more. In the days of the apostles, there was a time when God intended to bring a great dearth over all

the land. Of this no person had knowledge; it was a thing that belonged to God; and "the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God knows, for he searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." But it was necessary that the church should have knowledge of this coming calamity, and therefore the spirit must make it known unto the people. We now ask, how did he do it? Did he in some secret, indescribable manner, impress their minds with the notion that some awful judgment was coming upon the world? That he could have done this, we do not doubt; but the question is, *how did he do it?* Hear the answer: "And in those days came prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world." Acts xi, 27, 28.

Thus you see, my friends, that when the Holy Spirit proposed to reveal this matter to the church, he chose Agabus as the organ through whom to speak to the people.

Again, it is a matter of great importance to man, to know God's time and day of salvation. How many are anxiously waiting for the Lord's good time to save them? Well, this too belongs to God, and the spirit must make it known to man, if he ever learns it. This it has done, but we ask, how did it do it? The apostle answers, "The Holy Ghost saith, to-day if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Heb. iii, 7. This exhortation is found in the ninety-fifth Psalm, and Paul quotes it as the saying of the Holy Ghost. Again: "Behold now is the accepted time, behold now is the day of salvation." 2 Cor. vi, 2 Here the Holy Spirit has told us through Paul, that now is God's time to save sinners. The spirit also admonishes all who hear his word spoken by his chosen vessels, not to harden their hearts.

The next scripture we will introduce, showing how the Holy Spirit reveals the things of God to man, is found in 1 Corinthians, second chapter. Beginning at the ninth verse, we read as follows: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him." The apostle makes this declaration for the purpose of showing that no man ever learned the things which God has prepared for those who love him, by his own wisdom; and he does this in order to prove to his brethren at Corinth, that no man should glory in man; that they should not glory in Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, inasmuch as they never learned the things of God by their own researches into the volume of nature.

But it may now be asked, how did they obtain a knowledge of these things? The apostle answers: "God hath revealed them unto us by his spirit; for the spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." From these scriptures, some have concluded that man, in this state, can have no conception of the things which God hath reserved for his people in the world to come; but whether this idea is true or false, this passage is not designed to prove it; for the apostle shows that the very things which had not been seen or heard by man, unilluminated by the spirit, God had revealed to his apostles by his spirit. Some apply this declaration to all Christians, and therefore conclude that God, by a direct revelation of the Holy Spirit, reveals these heavenly things to every convert, at the time of his conversion. But the impropriety of this view will appear at once, when we consider the apostle's design in this whole argument. The Corinthians were saying, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas." To correct these improprieties, and to silence these contentions, Paul tells them that all they knew of the secret things of God, they

had received by inspiration of the Holy Spirit; and hence he says to them, in his second letter, speaking on the same subject, "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we (the apostles), have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." 2 Cor. iv, 6, 7.

But we now inquire, how is the world to learn these things? The apostle answers: "*Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given us of God;* WHICH THINGS ALSO WE SPEAK, *not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the* HOLY GHOST TEACHETH; *comparing spiritual things with spiritual;* or, according to Dr. McKnight, "explaining spiritual things in spiritual words."

Thus you perceive, my friends, that when the Holy Spirit would make known to men the things which God hath prepared for all who love and obey him, he revealed them to the apostles of Christ, and furnished them with words well calculated to make them known to all who might hear them. And now, if we desire to learn these things, we need not be seeking a new revelation by the Holy Spirit; such a revelation is not now necessary for this purpose. We have only to consult the writings of those by whom the spirit spoke, in order to learn all the heavenly Father intended us to know on these interesting items.

We will introduce one more scripture upon this subject, found in the third chapter of Paul's letter to the Ephesians. In this passage, the apostle mentions a mystery, or secret, which had been long hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ—which secret was this: "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs (with the Jews), and of the same

body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." This secret purpose belonged to God, and no man knew it. No man could seek it out by the light of nature; but the Spirit knew it, for "the spirit searcheth the deep things of God." That man might know the will of God on this subject, and thus be prepared to comply with that will, the Holy Spirit, who alone knoweth the things of God, must reveal it. We now ask, how did the spirit reveal this mystery to men? "By revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote afore in few words; whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets, by the Spirit."

Thus you see, my friends, that the spirit revealed this secret to the apostles and New Testament prophets of Christ, and through them made it known to others; that they committed it to writing, that in all time coming, those who would read, might understand their knowledge in the secret things of God.

Here, then, is a scriptural exposition of the way and manner in which the spirit enlightens the world. It first revealed God's will concerning man to the holy apostles and prophets; and they have committed these revelations to record. These writings make up that book which is labeled the "HOLY BIBLE;" and now, if we want to learn God's will concerning our conduct, we have only to read the scriptures given by inspiration of God, and "which are profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." According to this view the apostle saith, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches." But how am I to hear the spirit's voice? Must I wait to hear the spirit speak from heaven? It will not do to say that

the spirit is to reveal the things here proposed to be made known, by some secret impression upon the mind, for "*the spirit* SAYETH *these things* to the churches." And what does the spirit say? We answer, "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death." "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life." "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels." But how does the spirit say these things to the churches? I answer, through the word which was written by inspiration of God's Holy Spirit.

The practice of the religious world is strong evidence in favor of the position we have taken on this subject. Let me ask, what mean all the efforts of the Missionary Society—the Bible Society—and in fact, all the efforts made to sustain the preaching of the word? It all goes to prove that the Holy Spirit now speaks through the word, and that, in order to enlighten the world, man must have the Bible. If this is not so, we had as well save our talents and money, and appropriate them to some other purpose, and let the spirit enlighten the world by some direct inspiration, without any visible means. But as the spirit has given the Bible to enlighten mankind, and has commanded the church to hold it forth, and to preach it to every creature, we should spare no pains to give the Bible to the whole world; we should be ever willing to contribute of our means for the purpose of placing the holy scriptures in the reach of all, that every nation may have the privilege of reading the word of the Lord in their own language, that they may be convinced that they are sinners, see the goodness of the Lord, and be brought to that obedience which secures salvation.

According to all the scriptures that we have now adduced, how improper it is for a man who has had the Bible in his house all his life, to say, that when he was some thirty or

forty years old, the spirit for the first time showed him that he was a sinner! How could he blaspheme the name of the Lord, and not know that he was sinning against the Most High, when the Bible said that God will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain? Such a thing can not be. Ask them who say that the spirit, in some secret and mysterious way showed them that they were sinners, what particular act they had done without knowing it was sinful until the spirit revealed it, and can they name one? No, not one. Should they attempt it, you will find that every act which they name, that is in fact sinful, is forbidden in the word of God. This being so, a new revelation is not to be expected; nay, it is not even necessary.

Let those, then, who wish to know their true state and standing before the Lord, read the holy scriptures, and compare their purposes and actions with their divine requirements, and if they find that they are sinners against God, let them comply with the requirements of the Holy Spirit, as they are found in the will of God, which the spirit has made known in the Bible, that they may be pardoned.

We will now proceed with this investigation a little farther, and inquire, do not Christians enjoy the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in their hearts? We have so far been considering the work of the Spirit on the world, in enlightening man, and teaching him his duty to God, together with the things which the Lord has prepared for those who love and obey him. But we wish to come a little nearer the Christian's heart.

I now affirm that God does give his Holy Spirit to his people; that it does dwell in their hearts. And by this Spirit, I mean more than a mere disposition, or abstract quality; I mean the Spirit of the living God. If you should ask me, my friends, what that Spirit is, I have only one answer, and that is, it is the Spirit of God.

I will now proceed to read a few scriptures in proof of the position I have here taken:

Eph. ii, 22, "In whom ye are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." This scripture shows that it was the design of the Heavenly Father, in forming the church, to dwell in it by his Spirit; that it was to be the residence of the Holy Spirit. Again: in the fourth chapter and fourth verse of this same epistle, we have the following reading: "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." Here the apostle represents the church as a body, and the Holy Spirit as the principle of life in this body. As the body without the Spirit is dead naturally, so the church without the Holy Spirit is dead also. When God created man of the dust of the earth, he was complete in all his physical organization, but he had no life; he was cold and inactive; he could not perform the functions of a living body. But God breathed in him the breath of life, (or of lives), and he became a living soul, or he became alive. Now he could think, and feel, and move, and act. Just so in regard to the church spiritually. The church is a spiritual body, formed for the purpose of performing a spiritual work; but without the Spirit of God to animate this body, it is but a dead body, a lifeless corpse. The Lord designed however, that the church should be a living body, and hence, as soon as it was fully organized, he breathed into it his Holy Spirit; it came as the sound of a rushing mighty wind; the members were all filled with it, and thus enabled to perform the functions of a living body. And, notwithstanding the miraculous gifts, which were signs, not for them that believe, but for them that believe not, have ceased; yet it is still necessary that the church should be filled with the life-giving Spirit of our God, to enable her to perform the holy obligations resting upon her. Christians must "be strengthened with might by the Spirit in the

inner man," that they may be able "to serve God acceptably, with reverence and with Godly fear."

The next scripture we shall read on this subject is found in 1 Cor. vi, 19, and reads thus: "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which you have of God?" This apostolic declaration proves beyond a doubt, that the Spirit of God does dwell in his people.

Again: In Gal. iv, 6, Paul says, "Because you are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into your hearts, crying Abba Father." I understand this to be equally true in reference to all the sons and daughters of the Almighty; for the reason given why God had sent the Spirit into their hearts, applies to all the children of the Lord. Why did God give them the Spirit of his son? Not because they were apostles — not because they were set apart for any particular work by the imposition of hands — not to make them sons; but, *because they were sons.* All the children of the Lord then have an equal right to expect the Spirit of Christ, because they are all sons and daughters of the Lord.

The next and last scripture that we shall read upon this subject, is found in the eighth chapter of Romans. We will read from the commencement of the chapter, verse one: 'There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Who follow not the fleshly institutions of the law, but the spiritual precepts of the Gospel, verse two: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." We now ask, what law is here called the law of the Spirit of life? I suppose all admit that it is the same which is called by the apostle James, "the perfect law of liberty." This is the Spirit's law, given to man to free him from sin and death. But how is this done? I answer, by continuing therein, not being

forgetful hearers of the word, but doers of the work." Verses three and four: "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit;" that is, God has destroyed sin, or freed us from it by sending his own son in the flesh, and thus making a sin offering in our nature. This the law could not do, because of the weakness of our flesh; and this was done that we might fulfill all the righteous purposes of God in giving that law. Verse six: "For to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded, is life and peace." They who follow the dictates of a carnal wicked disposition, are dead to all the enjoyment of a holy life, and their course will lead to eternal death; but they whose minds are spiritual and heavenly, enjoy spiritual life and peace. Verses seven and eight: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God." Then all who wish to please the Lord should come out of that worldly, fleshly state; for while they remain in the flesh, that is the world, under the influence of a worldly mind, they never can please God. Verse nine: "But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." This shows that the apostle did not intend to teach that persons can not please the Lord while they remain in the body, as some have supposed; for he refers to some who are still in the body, but who are not in the flesh, in the sense of this scripture. They have come out of the world, and have come into the family of God; without doing which none can please the Lord. And the enjoyment of this blessed state is made to depend upon our having the Spirit of God dwelling in us, for Paul says, "if so be that

the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

This not only proves that Christians have the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit in their hearts, but it shows that those who have it not, are none of Christ's. It will not do to say that this only means the disposition of Christ, or the principles which actuated our blessed Lord, for the eleventh verse shows that more than this is meant: "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

By this we learn that a portion of the same Spirit which quickened the body of Christ, dwells in Christians, and no one will say that that body which was crucified, dead and buried, was brought to life again by a mere quality of mind. But we are not only told by the apostles, that Christians have the Spirit which raised Christ from the dead, but that this is the same Spirit that shall quicken, and raise the sleeping dead in the last day. Paul does not say that he *has* quickened your mortal bodies, but that he *will* do it, referring to the future; and he does not say that this shall be done by a Spirit which is now confined in heaven, and which shall be sent to earth at that time to raise the dead, but that it shall be done by the Spirit of God which now dwells in the Christian's heart. The Spirit of Christ is a resurrection Spirit, and this is the reason why those who have it ascend to heaven, in their minds. Under this divine influence, the feelings and desires of the heart seem to raise toward heaven. I believe that this is the very Spirit that translated Enoch and Elijah to heaven. We now enjoy a portion of it, and all that is wanting to take all the saints to heaven in the same way, is enough of the same Spirit which Christians now enjoy; an increase of quantity and not of quality, is what is wanting, and this shall be given when the

Lord's time to raise the dead and change the living saints, shall come. But while we wait for that, let us be resigned to God's will, and seek to enjoy much of his Holy Spirit. This is our privilege, and let us never be satisfied without it.

But before we dismiss this part of our subject, we will give one caution. The apostle John says: "Beloved believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God," 1 John iv, 1. From this admonition, it is clear that there is danger of being deceived. We may suppose that we have the Spirit of God, when we are under the influence of a very different spirit. Christ told his disciples on one occasion, that they did not know what manner of spirit they were of. Even so we now may suppose that we are filled with the Spirit of the Lord, and may rejoice under that belief, when we are actuated by the spirit of error, which is opposed to the Spirit of Christ.

The apostle John gives us a rule in the sixth verse of this chapter, by which we may always prove what manner of spirit we are influenced by, and what kind of spirit our teachers are of. He says: "We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of truth and the spirit of error." You will notice, my dear friends, that the apostle does not say, that by this rule we *suppose*, or *think*, or *guess*, which is the Spirit of truth, and which is the spirit of error; but by this we *know* the spirits. And what is the rule? Hear it again, my friends: "He that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us." By this rule, says John, "we know the Spirit of truth and the spirit of error."

And we now ask, what is it to hear the apostles? In answer to this interrogation, we will give Dr. McKnight's note on this expression. "Hearkeneth to us. This mark

by which John directed his disciples to judge of teachers, is not to be understood of their hearkening to the apostles personally, but of their receiving their doctrine with that submission which was due to persons inspired by the Spirit of God. Wherefore, though the apostles be all dead, yet as they still speak in their divinely inspired writings, John in this passage declares that their writings are the test by which the disciples of Christ, since the decease of the apostles, are to judge both teachers and their doctrine." Every spirit, then, which leads to an entire submission to the will of God, as contained in the writings of His holy apostles, and obedience to all his commandments just as he has given them, without any changing, or wresting them to suit our own views of propriety, is of God. But every spirit that leads to a neglect of God's commands; that would change the mode of obeying them; or that would teach that any of these commands are unessential, is not of God. I care not how much zeal the person possessing that spirit may manifest, nor how much he may rejoice, nor how loud he may talk about his good feelings, he has not the Holy Spirit. He may not know what manner of spirit he is of, but it is certain, the apostle John being judge, that he has not the right kind of spirit; he has the spirit of error and not the Spirit of truth. O! then, let us all try ourselves by this rule, that we may be able to assure our hearts before the Lord.

We now wish to introduce one more inquiry, and when we shall have noticed that, we will close this discourse. The question we now propose is this: Is the Holy Spirit received conditionally? Does the Heavenly Father give his Spirit to persons while in disobedience, or must man obey his Creator in order to get his Holy Spirit?

We consider this a very important inquiry, and one that should be correctly, that is, scripturally answered; for the

answer an individual gives to this question, will very much control his conduct. If, for example, I answer that man can not obey God until he receive the Holy Spirit, in order to influence him to obedience, I will be very apt to remain in disobedience, waiting for that spirit. But if I conclude that I must obey the Lord, in order to obtain his Spirit, I will be inclined to do the will of God that I may enjoy his good Spirit. Considering the importance of this interrogation, we will not make a proposition on it; for a person may make a proposition, and then bend and scrap the scriptures so as to seem to prove it, although that proposition may be entirely repugnant to the word of God. We will proceed, therefore, to read a few scriptures which have a bearing on this question, and from them endeavor to learn the truth.

"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and thus cried: if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me as the scripture hath said, out of his heart" (*koilias*, from *koilos*, which means the breast, heart, inward parts,) "shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive."

The point in this quotation to which we invite special attention, is, that faith in Christ, and coming to him, are set forth as terms upon which the Spirit is to be received. The Saviour here says to all who desire to enjoy the Spirit of God, that if they will believe on him and come unto him according to his holy word, they shall receive that good Spirit to overflowing.

In John xiv, 15, we read as follows: "If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him."

According to this plain declaration of the Saviour, it is as clear as cloudless noonday, that we must do the commandments of God in order to receive his Spirit.

But again: In Acts v, 32, we have these words: "And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to all them that obey him." This scripture not only proves that God does give his Holy Spirit to all who obey him, but plainly implies that he does not give it to those who refuse to obey him.

The next passage we will read is found in Eph. i, 13: "In whom ye also trusted after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." From this scripture it will be seen, that the persons here named heard the gospel, believed in Christ, and trusted in the Lord for salvation, before they received the holy, sealing Spirit of God. The apostle does not say, ye received the Holy Spirit to enable you to believe; but, "*after ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit.*"

The next and last scripture that we shall now read, is found in Acts ii, 38, and reads as follows: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This is an answer given to an interrogation of the most important character, under the most trying circumstances. By the preaching of Peter, many had been made to feel their ruined condition, and under the deepest concern of soul, they "cried out, men and brethren, what shall we do?" In answer to this important question, the apostle uttered the words just quoted, in which you will see, my dear friends, that repentance and baptism are made terms upon which the Holy Spirit is promised. "REPENT and be BAPTIZED," said Peter, "AND YE SHALL RECEIVE THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT."

From all these scriptures which we have now introduced, (and you would do well to read them with their connection, on your retirement, my friendly hearers,) we come to the following plain and natural conclusion: That faith in Christ, and a coming to him by reformation and baptism, are the terms laid down in the gospel, upon which God has promised his Holy Spirit to man; and that in order to retain that Comforter within our hearts, we must continue to keep his commandments.

In view of all that we have now said on this subject, permit me, in conclusion, to say to all who have named the name of Christ, "be steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as you know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." Watch against all the vicious influences of the world, the flesh, and the devil; and ever keep yourselves unspotted by the evil practices of a wicked and perverse generation. Shun every appearance of evil, and live soberly, and righteously and godly in this present world. "Do good unto all men, and especially to those who are of the household of faith." O! let us all endeavor to walk worthy the vocation wherewith we are called, with all meekness, and lowliness, and long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; and last, but by no means least, let us not neglect to meet the Lord's people, in the Lord's house, on the Lord's day. Here it is that we may make a near approach to the Lord, and receive much of his good spirit, and obtain grace to help in every time of need.

Remember, my Christian brethren, that the nearer we live to the Lord, the more of his Holy Spirit we shall enjoy. O! then, let us endeavor to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless, that we may be comforted and strengthened with might by the Spirit in the

inner man, and thus be enabled to glorify God in our bodies and spirits, which are his, while we remain upon the earth; and that we may be quickened by his spirit in the morning of great eternity, and enter upon the enjoyment of undying glories, in the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

And you, my friends, who have not submitted to the law of Christ, let me exhort you to come to the Saviour, that you may be pardoned and receive his good Spirit. Remember, now is the accepted time, and now is the day of salvation. "The Spirit and the bride say come, and let him that heareth say come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." If, then, you desire to receive that good Spirit, you see you must COME to Christ for it. Then rely upon him for salvation, repent of all your sins, reform your lives, and resolve, before God, angels and men, that you will spend the remnant of your days in the service of the Lord; and, with this determination deeply fixed in your heart, go forward and be buried with the Lord in baptism, and arise and walk in newness of life. In thus obeying the gospel, you have the promise of the forgiveness of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, to cheer you through life's rugged journey; and, if faithful to death, you shall receive a crown of life that fadeth not away. O! then, fly to Jesus while you may, lest procrastination should prove your eternal ruin.

SERMON IX.

ELECTION.

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace be multiplied. 1 PETER i, 1, 2.

FROM many expressions found in this epistle, it seems to have been written at a time of great persecution. On account of their attachment to Christ and his holy religion, Christians were driven from their homes, and scattered abroad through the various parts of the country named in the commencement of this epistle. And now, lest they should be overcome by sufferings and poverty, and thus be led to abandon the cause of Christ, Peter writes this letter for the purpose of comforting them in their deep distress. Hence, he says to them, in the fourth chapter, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you, but rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy."

Among the many things which he brings to their remembrance as sources of consolation, is the fact that they are the elect of God—elected according to his foreknowledge. And I ask, what was better calculated to comfort them, in the midst of the sufferings and deaths to which they were

constantly exposed, than the fact that they were God's elect, or chosen people? They could well say, in view of this fact, "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

From this scripture, as well as many others which might be quoted, you will see, my friends, that the doctrine of election is a Bible doctrine. I take the ground to-day that the scriptures do teach the doctrine of election by grace.

But in regard to this Bible doctrine, there are two general views entertained. Some present the subject in the following light:

Long before time began, there was a secret covenant entered into between the Father and the Son, by virtue of which a certain number of the human family was given to Christ. These, Christ agreed with the Father, to save—and therefore he will save them. These are the elect, and their salvation was thus unconditionally secured from all eternity. This is called eternal election, and the number thus elected is said to be so definite that it can not be increased or diminished.

(I have always wondered, if this electing covenant was a secret covenant, how the preachers found it out.)

It is further held that those who were not embraced in that eternal covenant are passed by in the councils of redemption, so that there is no salvation for them—they must perish, and that forever. It was once taught that these were reprobated from all eternity to everlasting damnation; but I believe there are but few, if any, who openly avow that sentiment now. Instead of saying the *elect and reprobate*, now, they say, the *elect* and the *passed by*.

The other view of the doctrine of election is the following: That to elect is to choose, and that there is a time in the history of all the chosen when this election takes place; that this election is obtained on certain conditions, and that these conditions are made known to all, in the gospel, and

all who comply with them become the elect of God; while those who will not comply with God's terms of election, are reprobated by their own evil works, and, dying in this state, will be condemned, because they had pleasure in unrighteousness.

This last view of the doctrine of election is ours; but we have no doubt that many very honest persons hold the former. I have no doubt but that they honestly believe that their views are found in the Holy Scriptures; hence, they will quote many passages to sustain the position they have taken on the subject. Well, we now design entering into a careful examination of most of the scriptures which are relied on to sustain the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election and passing by, for the purpose of seeing if they really do prove that doctrine.

But before entering upon this investigation, we concede that there have been many special, particular, and, I may say, unconditional elections under the government of the Heavenly Father. All such elections, however, were for the good of others, and not for the special and exclusive benefit of the persons elected. Christ is the elect of God, but he was chosen to "give his life a ransom for all to be testified in due time." The seed of Abraham was an elect seed; but it was chosen to be the means of blessing others. "In thy seed," said God, "shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Paul was a chosen vessel, but he was elected to go to the "Gentiles, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they might obtain remission of sins, and an inheritance among the sanctified." But now, whether those thus elected enjoyed the favor of God, and got to heaven, depended upon the faithful discharge of the duties imposed upon them by virtue of their election. Hence Paul had to

keep his body under subiection, lest after he had preached to others he himself should be a castaway.

But we now proceed to the investigation. The first scripture we will examine is found in Isaiah i, 5, 6, and reads thus: "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint; from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores."

This scripture is adduced, not so much to prove the doctrine of election and passing by, as to support another feature of the system, namely: that all mankind are by nature totally and hereditarily depraved It is held that by reason of this total depravity, man, in a state of nature, can not think a good thought, or perform a good act; and that all that is necessary in order to consummate the ruin of the whole world is for God to withhold his special and enlightening grace. But that he does, of his own good will, impart illuminating and converting grace to the elect; not to make them God's people, but to let them know that they are his.

I have sometimes heard this illustrated in this way: A owes B fifty dollars, and is not able to pay it. C, as A's surety, pays the debt, in the absence of A. Now B has no demand against A, but as A has no knowledge of the fact, he may have much uneasiness on the subject. But B now sends A a receipt, not because A has paid the fifty dollars, but to let him know that C has paid it for him. So God converts the sinner—not to make him God's elect, but to let him know that he was such.

Upon the scripture just quoted from Isaiah, we will remark that it has no reference to any person now living, and that it never was intended to apply to the moral state of man by nature. To prove this first remark, we

need only read the first verse of the chapter, and of the book.

"The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah." Thus you perceive that this vision had exclusive reference to Judah and Jerusalem in the days of these four kings. We sometimes illustrate the meaning of this scripture by the following figure: Suppose a father has a rebellious son. He reasons with him, and exhorts him to obey his father, but he still refuses. He then chastises him, but he still disobeys. He lays upon him many stripes; but he still rebels, until his father exclaims, O! sinful child, why need you be stricken any more? You will rebel more and more. The head is sick, and the whole heart is faint; from head to foot there is no soundness; you are full of wounds and bruises by means of the stripes I have inflicted upon you. Come, now, and let us reason together upon this subject. Thus it was with the Jewish nation at this time. They had rebelled against God, and hence he says, "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." For this rebellion, God had brought on them one judgment after another, but still they rebelled, until he breaks forth in the doleful words first quoted, and declares that they are full of wounds from the sole of the foot even unto the head. The whole nation, from the king upon the throne to the meanest subject, were suffering on account of these chastisements of the Lord. Hence, he says, "Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire, your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate as overthrown by strangers: And the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city." These judgments and calamities are the wounds and bruises complained of in this prophecy,

and these were brought upon them for their own wickedness, and not because of their natural depravity.

The next scripture that we shall notice is found in the first chapter of Ephesians, and reads thus: "According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love; having predestined us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself. In whom we also have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Eph. i. 4. 5. 11.

You will notice, my friends, that the apostle does not say of these persons that they were predestinated *children*, but that they were predestinated unto the *adoption of children*—that is, they were predestinated to be adopted into the family of God, by Christ Jesus. But now, in order to enjoy the benefits of this predestination, it was necessary for them to be adopted. I now make the following propositions: First—some of the very persons who were thus predestinated failed to enjoy the benefits of their predestination, and were lost. Second—some who were not of the predestinated number here spoken of, were adopted into the family of God, and sealed with the Holy Spirit. If these two points can be sustained, you perceive that we need not be much concerned to know whether we are of the predestinated number or not—for if we are, we may be lost, and if we are not, still we may be saved; and thus it will be seen that this scripture does not sustain the doctrine of unconditional, eternal election and passing by.

But in order to understand this scripture, we must notice who the writer is, and who the persons addressed are. Paul is the writer, and he was a Jew. He says, "I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham." This address was made to those who had embraced the Christian religion

from among the Gentiles; and hence, the apostle says to them: "Remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands." Ch. ii. 11, 12. Then we have a Christian Jew writing to Gentile Christians.

Now, you will notice, my friends, that the apostle changes his mode of address some two or three times in the course of this chapter. "Grace be to *you* from God our Father." V. 2. Here he addresses them in the second person, but in the fourth verse he changes his mode of address, and says, "According as he hath chosen *us* (not *you*) in him from the foundation of the world." "Having predestinated *us* (not *you*, Gentiles) unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ." But at the thirteenth verse he again changes the person of his address, and says, "In whom *ye also* trusted, after that *ye* heard the word of truth," etc. Now, by the particle *also*, the apostle shows that the persons spoken of in this verse were not included in anything said from the close of the third verse to the commencement of the thirteenth—consequently they did not belong to the predestinated number of whom Paul here speaks; and yet when they believed, they were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. But of those predestinated it is said: "He came to his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name." John i. 11. 12.

Thus you perceive that the Jews were the predestinated —they were predestined before the foundation of the Jewish age to be adopted the children of God; but faith in Christ was one of the conditions of the adoption; hence those who did not believe never obtained the privilege of this adoption. But when the Gentiles who were not thus

specially predestinated believed in Christ, they obtained the power to become the sons of God. They trusted in Christ, and were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.

The next scripture we will notice, which is relied on to prove the doctrine of unconditional and eternal election, is found in the eighth chapter of Romans, and reads thus: "For whom he foreknew, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethen. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." V. 29, 30.

In order to understand this scripture, as well as other portions of this epistle, which we shall examine in this investigation, it will be necessary to notice the design of the apostle's argument.

At the time this letter was written—as noticed in a previous discourse—a controversy was going on in reference to the privileges which should be granted to those who turned to God from among the Gentiles. The Jews contended that the privileges and blessings of the gospel should not be granted unto the Gentile world. The apostles taught that God had granted unto the Gentiles all the blessings of the gospel, on the same terms on which they were offered to the Jews. That, under the reign of Christ, no difference was made between the two nations, but that all stood on equal ground, so far as the gospel was concerned. This accounts for the following expression, found in this letter: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Ch. i. 16. "Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, and honor, and peace, to every one that worketh

good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." Ch. ii. 9, 10. "Are we (Jews), better than they (the Gentiles)? No, in no wise; for we have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Ch. iii, 9. "Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles. Cometh this blessedness upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also?" Ch. iv, 9.

You will find, my friends, that this epistle abounds with expressions of this kind, all of which go to show, beyond the possibility of doubt or cavil, that Paul's main object in writing this letter, was to settle the controversy before mentioned, and to prove that, under the gospel, no difference should be made between Jew and Gentile; that all should enjoy the same privileges. To oppose this view, the Jews would refer to the high privileges and national glory which God granted them under the old covenant, and contend that these blessings were granted to them because they were better than other men. But the apostle tells them, that as a nation they are no better than the Gentiles, but that God had given them these honors because of a predestination which had passed in his mind, long before they were brought into the actual possession of them. For whom he did foreknow, he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. But we now ask, whom did he foreknow? Near the conclusion of this general argument, the apostle says: "Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people, whom he foreknew." Ch. xi, 1, 2. That is, God hath not cast away the whole Jewish nation; for "as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." This shows clearly that the Jewish nation, or the seed of Abraham, was *the foreknown*

of God, who were predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son; or, according to Ephesians i, 4, to be adopted into the family of God.

Now says the apostle, in reference to those whom he foreknew, "Whom he did predestinate, them he also called." But when and where did he call these predestinated ones? "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt." Hosea xi, 1. By the hand of Moses did God call and bring his people whom he foreknew, or approved before, out of the land of bondage, unto a goodly land. And those whom he thus called, he also justified. He justified them in going into the land of Canaan, and taking possession of it. On what principle could they have been justified in driving out the holders of the land, and taking it into their own possession, only that God foreknew them in the covenant he made with their father Abraham, which covenant secured to them this land? "And whom he justified, them he also glorified." The word *glorified*, Webster defines thus: "Honored, dignified, exalted to glory." One of the prophets, speaking of the glory which had once dwelt in the house of God, among the Jews, but which had been lost by reason of sin, says: "I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house (the Temple rebuilt), shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts." Hag. ii, 7, 9. Yes, my friends, God gave this people glory and honor above all the nations of the earth. He even honored them with the emblem of the divine presence. Hence we learn, that when Moses had finished the tabernacle, "then a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle." Ex. xl, 34.

Thus was the seed of Abraham foreknown, called, justified

and glorified; and the apostle introduces these facts here, to show them that they had not attained these privileges by their own good works, but they were granted unto them by virtue of a divine arrangement made with Abraham, before they were born. The conclusion, then, would be, if God sees proper to grant the blessings of the gospel to the Gentiles, the Jews ought not to complain; that God's manner of dealing with them would fully justify him in extending all gospel blessings to the whole world, on the same terms. Thus it will be seen, that instead of this scripture proving the doctrine of eternal, unconditional election to heavenly glories, it is but a part of an argument leveled directly against that very doctrine.

I know that some good brethren apply this passage to the ancient saints who have been called from earth to glory; perhaps those who rose at the resurrection of Christ; but I can see no reason why Paul should introduce those persons into this argument. I can not see what bearing their case would have had upon the subject. But the view we have presented, is in good keeping with the whole argument, as will appear more fully as we proceed.

We will now invite attention to the ninth chapter of this epistle. This chapter has been thought to contain more Calvanism than any other portion of the New Testament. Some have called Paul a Calvinist, and the apostle James an Arminian; but we make no such distinctions among the witnesses of our Lord.

But to the chapter. "I say the truth in Christ; I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." Paul seems to make this statement for the purpose of preparing his brethren for his following

arguments, and especially for a declaration which he makes in the eleventh chapter: "What then! Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded," etc. V. 7.

He would seem to say, I do not make this statement out of any ill will which I entertain toward my brethren, for "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart" for them. Some render this passage thus: "I have great grief and unceasing anguish in my heart, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, (for I also was, myself, wishing to be accursed from Christ)." That is, I have great feeling for them, for I once had the same views of Christ which they now have.

This rendering seems natural, and well agrees with Paul's past history. He then proceeds to speak of his brethren thus: "Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption?" etc. By virtue of the predestination which we have already noticed, the adoption belonged to them. But by rejecting Christ, they lost this privilege. "Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel who are of Israel. Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, at this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son," Ishmael was indeed a son of Abraham, but not the son of promise; but Isaac being the promised son, the seed was reckoned in him.

"For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son." This reference to the promise which God made to Abraham, Paul makes, for the purpose of showing that the Lord granted unto Isaac the privilege of being the progenitor of the promised seed

because of that promise, and not because of any good thing which he had done. And the force of this remark will be seen at once when we consider the subject which the apostle is discussing. You will remember, my friends, that the great apostle of the Gentiles is here defending the rights and privileges of that people. The subject of privilege, then, is the subject under consideration. The Jews claimed privileges above the Gentiles, on account of their good works, and because of the high favors which God had conferred upon them. But Paul here lets them know that Isaac received the privilege of being the progenitor of the promised seed by virtue of a promise made to his father before he was born, and hence, that it could not have been on account of any good works which he had done. The natural conclusion would then be this: that if God saw proper to grant the blessings of the gospel to the Gentiles, the Jews had no reason to complain.

This view will appear still more fully as we proceed. "And not only so," (God not only chose Isaac in preference to Ishmael), "but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac, (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good nor evil, that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth), it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger." Verses 10, 11, 12. The eleventh verse is a parenthesis, and hence we would understand the apostle better by reading the tenth and twelfth verses together; thus, "when Rebecca had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac, it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger."

But then the question may be asked, Why was this said unto her? Paul answers, "That the purpose of God, according to election, might stand." And what was that purpose? We answer, that the promised seed might be

reckoned in Jacob, and not in Esau. This was not an election to heavenly glories, and a reprobation to eternal ruin. Heaven and hell are not the subjects under consideration. The promised seed must of necessity be counted in one of these two sons, and God had the right to say which; and by the exercise of that right, he chose, or elected, Jacob for that purpose. But in doing so, he did not consign Esau to eternal torment. Nor did the choosing of Jacob for the purpose here spoken of secure to him a place in heaven without any future effort on his part. This depended upon his personal conduct in this life.

But the apostle proceeds: "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated." Without noticing the connection of these verses, some have thought that Paul here teaches that God loved Jacob and hated Esau before they were born. But, my friends, by looking at this passage again, you will perceive that the apostle does not say that God said unto Rebecca, that he had loved Jacob and hated Esau; but, that the elder should serve the younger. And then he says, "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated." But we ask, Where was this written? We answer, in the very last book in the Old Testament—some twelve hundred years after Jacob and Esau had both gone to the silence of the tomb. That we may understand this declaration, we must remember that the names of Jacob and Esau were applied to their descendants after their death, as national titles. The whole Jewish nation was called Jacob, and Israel, after their father; and the same is true in reference to Esau; and hence, the hatred and love mentioned in Malachi i, 2, 3, applied to Jacob and Esau nationally, and not individually. In this passage the Lord complains of Israel, saying: "I have loved you, saith the Lord; yet ye say, wherein hast thou loved us?" Then God answers: "Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the

Lord; yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness."

But the question may now be started, Why did the hatred or displeasure of the Lord thus rest upon Esau, or the Edomites? A plain and satisfactory answer will be found in the book of Obadiah. We commence reading at the eighth verse: "Shall I not in that day, saith the Lord, even destroy the wise men out of Edom, and understanding out of mount Esau? And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one of the mount of Esau may be cut off by slaughter." But why did God thus deal with the descendants of Esau? Was it because he had determined so to deal with them even before their father was born? Or was it on account of their own personal wickedness? Hear the answer my friends: "For thy violence against thy brother Jacob, shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off forever." V. 10.

After the Lord had called to remembrance the unrighteous conduct of that people, he proceeds thus: "For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen; AS THOU HAST DONE, IT SHALL BE DONE UNTO THEE; THY REWARD SHALL RETURN UPON THINE OWN HEAD." V. 15. Thus, my friends, you perceive that, instead of this passage favoring eternal and unconditional election to heavenly glories and reprobation to eternal burnings, it proves that just and equitable doctrine, that God will render to every one according to his works.

But we now return to the consideration of the ninth chapter of Romans. "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." Verses 14, 15. That God has the sovereign right to exercise

his mercy and compassion on whom he will, none will deny. But if it be asked, Upon whom will he exercise his mercy? we answer, in the words of David: "With the merciful, thou wilt show thyself merciful, and with the upright thou wilt show thyself upright. With the pure thou wilt show thyself pure, and with the froward thou wilt show thyself froward; and the afflicted people thou wilt save; but thine eyes are upon the haughty, that thou mayest bring them down." 2 Sam. xxii, 26, 27, 28.

But Paul proceeds: "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." V. 16. With what an appearance of triumph do predestinarians introduce this scripture into their religious discourses! This declaration is applied to the subject of becoming Christians, and getting to heaven, and from it, it is argued that these blessings are not to be obtained by willing or striving—that the sinner must wait God's good time, and if he wills to have mercy upon them, he will do so without any willing or running on their part—for, say they, it is not of him that willeth, nor him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.

But, my friends, the whole meaning of this passage turns upon the little neuter pronoun IT. Surely, it will not do to make pardon, and heaven, the antecedent to *it*, in this sentence, when these subjects have not even been mentioned in the preceding connection. What is the subject under consideration? We again remind you, friends, that the apostle is here discussing the subject of privilege; and now referring to what he had said about the privileges granted to Isaac and Jacob, and which had long continued to their posterity, he says: "It is not of him that willeth, nor runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." You know, my dear hearers, that Isaac willed that Esau should have the blessing, and Esau ran for it, but Jacob got it, and with it

the privilege of being the progenitor of the promised seed. But why is this matter referred to here? I answer, to prove to the Jews that if God sees proper to grant the privileges of the gospel to the Gentiles, the Jews have no right to complain, for the matter of privilege is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God, who alone has the right to offer gospel privileges to whom he will.

"For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth." Verses 17, 18.

This passage has also been forced into the service of those who teach the doctrine of unconditional election and passing by. But if it has anything to do with that doctrine, it not only proves that God saves the elect unconditionally, but that he also hardens the hearts of those whom he has passed by, and thus makes their condition even worse than it is by nature! WORSE AND WORSE. The advocates of the doctrine which we are now examining tell us that all men are, by nature, totally and hereditarily depraved, and all that is necessary to consummate their ruin is for God to withhold from them his enlightening and quickening grace. And then, in order to sustain a falling system, it must be made appear that notwithstanding the non-elect are by nature wholly indisposed to do any good thing, yet, lest they should peradventure put forth their hand and obey the Lord, God hardens their heart, and makes them worse than even total depravity itself!!

In regard to Pharaoh's case, we differ from many who do not believe in the doctrine of eternal election. Some suppose that God only hardened Pharaoh's heart by conferring

blessings upon him; as blessings rejected tend to harden; but from the entire testimony found in the history of that wicked king, I am bound to believe that God did directly and miraculously harden his heart.

By referring to Exodus iv, 21, you see that when God appeared unto Moses to send him into Egypt to deliver Israel, he told him that he would harden the heart of Pharaoh. This promise was made before Moses had even performed one miracle in the presence of Pharaoh, or had brought one judgment upon him. And by reading the whole history of that wicked monarch, you will find that it is said three times that Pharaoh hardened his own heart; three times it is said that his heart was hardened, without saying who did it; four times God said that he would harden his heart, and seven times it is said most positively that God did harden his heart. We therefore conclude that the Lord did harden Pharaoh's heart, but we ask, Why did he do it? The Lord answers: "That I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth."

When any government decides that for certain crimes the transgressor shall be put to death, the same government has a right to say in what way he shall be executed, and all wise and benevolent men seek to make the execution accomplish the greatest amount of good to the living.

On this very principle did God act toward Pharaoh. He had forfeited his life by his own wicked works, and the Lord determined to identify his death with the deliverance of his people in such a manner as to show that he did not come to his end in an ordinary way, but that he was destroyed by the direct power of God. This would be calculated to deter others from wickedness.

According to this view, we read that when the children of Israel were upon the banks of the Red Sea, and Pharaoh

and his hosts were now in sight, that "the Lord said unto Moses: ⁘ ⁘ ⁘ Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward, ⁘ ⁘ ⁘ and I, even I, will harden the hearts of the Egyptians, and they shall follow them, and I will get me honor upon Pharaoh, and upon his hosts," etc. Ex. xiv, 13, etc.

But why is this case alluded to here? I answer, to show the Jews that notwithstanding God had broken them off from the blessings and privileges of the gospel, and had poured upon them the spirit of sleep and slumber, and darkened their eyes so that they might not see, he had only treated them as he had treated others for their sins. Thus, it will be seen that this passage has nothing whatever to do with the doctrine of unconditional election and passing by.

But let us continue our examination of the ninth chapter of Romans. "Thou wilt say then unto me, why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God. Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?"

This scripture has long been used to support the doctrine of unconditional and eternal election and reprobation.

Some seem to think, that because God has the same right to dispose of men according to his own pleasure, that the potter possesses over his clay, that it follows, as a matter of course, that he has predestined the eternal destiny of all men. But this is by no means a fair conclusion. Because the potter has power over his clay, to make of the same lump, one vessel for a more honorable purpose than another, it does not follow that he will make some vessels for destruction.

But because we are not willing to admit that God did, from all eternity, elect some men and angels to everlasting glory, and that he passed by all others, and left them to be eternally miserable—some think that we limit the power of God—that we are not willing for the Lord of the universe to do as he pleases with his own. But, my friends, we are the last persons to object to the sovereignty of God. We believe that he has the same power over the whole human family that the potter has over the clay. Yes, my friends, we are all in the hands of God, as clay in the hands of the potter. He has an undisputed right to dispose of all men according to his own will, and to stipulate the terms upon which he will make one man a vessel of honor, and another a vessel of dishonor.

At this point, Predestinarians object, virtually, to the sovereignty of God, and manifest an unwillingness for the heavenly Father to do as he pleases. Yes, at this very point, this charge, which they have so often preferred against others, falls upon themselves. They oppose the very idea of conditions in this matter, and would reason the Lord out of his own terms, because, forsooth, they think it incompatible with the sovereign power of God, for him to suspend the destiny of man upon conditions. But we contend that the Lord has a right to do with us as seemeth to him good, and that he has suspended our weal or woe on our own conduct.

Inasmuch, then, as we are all in the hands of God, as clay in the hands of the potter, we ask, on what terms does the Lord propose to make vessels of honor, or of dishonor? This is an important question; it has in it interests which reach into the world of spirits, and lay hold on things invisible and eternal. That we may fully understand this matter, we will now turn to the eighteenth chapter of Jeremiah, and read from the commencement:

"The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, arise and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. Then I went down to the potter's house, and behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter; so he made it again, another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it." V. 1, 2, 3, 4.

Here was a literal fact which transpired before the prophet. The potter had intended to make one kind of vessel of the lump upon which he was operating when the prophet visited him; but it was marred in his hands, so that it would not answer the purpose first proposed. Well, the clay was his own; he could do as he pleased with it, and therefore he just made of it another vessel, according to his own will.

While this example was resting upon the prophet's mind—while he was reflecting upon the manner in which the potter had disposed of that piece of clay, he says: "Then the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, O house of Israel, can not I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hands, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel." V. 5, 6.

From this declaration, you see that the Lord applies this parable to the house of Israel, and by it would give the Jews to understand, that they, as a nation, were in his hand, as clay in that potter's hand—and that he could mold them into vessels of honor or dishonor, according to his own good pleasure. But he does not leave them without farther instruction, for he proceeds to tell them his own terms—or conditions, if you please—upon which the honor or dishonor of any people rests. Hear it, my friends.

"At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck, and to pull down and to destroy it: if that nation against whom I have pronounced,

turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a kingdon, to build and to plant it: if it do evil in in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." V. 7, 8, 9, 10.

This removes the vail from the doctrine of the potter and the clay, and shows, in the light of heaven's eternal truth, the principle upon which every man's destiny will be forever settled. The people of Nineveh understood this principle, and notwithstanding God had said, by the mouth of his prophet, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown,"—without expressing one single condition—yet they, believing God, repented in sackcloth and ashes, and cried mightily to God, saying, "Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not." And the Lord did deal with them according to the principle developed in the eighteenth chapter of Jeremiah; for when "God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way, he repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them, and he did it not." See Jonah iii.

But if any should ask, why does Paul introduce the potter and the clay into his argument, in the ninth of Romans, we answer, for the purpose of justifying the ways of God to man, and to show the Jews, that notwithstanding they had been formed of the Lord for vessels of honor, yet by their own evil doings they had become marred in the hands of the Lord, so that he was now about to mold them into vessels of dishonor. He had endured with much long-suffering these vessels of wrath, who had fitted themselves for destruction; but he now determined to bear with them no longer; hence Paul declares, in this general connection, that they were broken off because of unbelief. As

a nation, God has dealt with them as the potter, whom Jeremiah saw, did with the clay. They were marred in his hand, and he has made them vessels of dishonor, even until this day.

Paul would further prove, by the example of the potter and the clay, that if the Gentiles should turn from their sins, and do that which is right, the Lord will make them vessels of honor, and that no one durst reply against God; "for the potter has power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another to dishonor."

Thus, my friends, you perceive that this chapter when rightly understood, according to the apostle's design, fails, utterly fails, to sustain the doctrine of eternal, unconditional election and passing by; and hence, that system must go off, limping, to some other part of the good book, for support.

But if any should ask, is the principle laid down in the eighteenth of Jeremiah, found anywhere in the New Testament, we refer them to 2 Tim. ii, 20, 21.

After the apostle had named many vices which were practiced by men, he says: "But in a great house, there are not only vessels of gold and of silver; but also of wood and of earth, and some to honor, and some to dishonor. If a man, therefore, purge himself from these, (the crimes just named), he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work."

Here we have the same principle set forth, and hence we would say to you to-day, my friends, if you wish to be vessels of honor, prepared for heavenly glory, purge yourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, and endeavor to perfect holiness in the sight of God.

But we will now consider the scripture which we read at the commencement of this discourse.

"Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. i, 1, 2.

Notwithstanding this passage of Scripture does prove the doctrine of election, yet it does not prove the doctrine of unconditional, eternal election and passing by, for the following reasons:

1. They were elected through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, but they could not have been thus sprinkled before they were born.

2. They were elected through a sanctification of spirit unto obedience, or by having their spirits set apart to obedience. This was a personal matter, and could not have been performed "before the world was made, or Adam formed."

3. They were elected according to the foreknowledge of God. Now foreknowledge is generally understood to mean, knowledge of an event before it comes to pass; hence these persons were elected according to a system of which God had knowledge before they were elected. This being so, they could not have been elected from all eternity; for in that case, their election would have been as old as God's knowledge. There could have been no foreknowledge about it.

4. But in the fourth place, we remark, that to elect is to choose; to choose is an act; every act implies a time when it is performed, and hence no act can be performed from all eternity; therefore these persons were not thus elected. It is just as contradictory to say that the elect were chosen from all eternity, as to say that the world was made from all eternity. Should an individual assume the last position, you would all reply that this could not be. You would say, that if the world was made, it is not eternal; and if it is eternal, it never was made. Just so we say in reference to

election. If they were Christ's people from all eternity, they never were elected; and if they were elected, they were not his, in this special sense, from all eternity; but Peter says they were the elect of God, and hence they were not chosen from all eternity.

The phrase "foreknowledge," in the Scriptures, generally refers to something which God had made known before — hence the elect of God, in the gospel dispensation, are chosen according to a system of which God had given some knowledge before it was fully developed. This knowledge is found in various parts of the Old Testament, but particularly named in the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah. In this chapter, God promises the new covenant, in which promise he says, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people."

You will notice, my friends, that they were not the people of God at the time this knowledge was given, for, saith he, "*they shall be my people*," referring to some future time.

Now all who were elected according to the stipulations of that covenant, when made, were elected according to the foreknowledge of God. This covenant we all understand to be the Gospel, or New Testament of our Lord and Saviour.

Now that we may fully understand this matter, we will introduce the first elections which ever took place by virtue of the new covenant. This covenant never could be ratified while the old covenant stood, and hence Christ took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. But as Christ was to be the mediator of this new covenant, it never could be in full force until he appeared, with his own blood, in the presence of God, for all who should become the elect of God according to that new institution; hence said Jesus to his disciples, "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endowed with power from on high."

According to this command, after the Lord ascended, "they returned into Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath-day's journey. And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room," where about one hundred and twenty of the disciples remained together, waiting for this super-human power, by which they should know that their Lord was crowned, the covenant sealed, and all things were ready to commence this great work of election.

While they were thus in one place, with one accord, "suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance."

By this divine power, the apostles were enabled to speak to the understanding of all present. They pointed out to them the wickedness of their former conduct, and proved by testimony which they could not doubt, that God had raised the same Jesus whom they crucified, from the dead, and made him both Lord and Christ. "Now when they heard this, they were pierced in their hearts, and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the apostles, men and brethren what shall we do?"

These very persons had long been the people of God, nationally, by virtue of the old covenant, but they now saw that that covenant was done away; that they could claim nothing upon its principles; that they had sinned egregiously in rejecting and crucifying the Lord of glory; and that unless they could obtain pardon, and become the elect of God, by virtue of the new covenant which God promised by the prophet Jeremiah, they must be miserable forever. Overwhelmed with these awful reflections, and pierced in their

very hearts, they cry out, "Men and brethren what shall we do?"

My friends, will you hear the answer of these newly inspired witnesses of our divine Lord? O hear it, and let it sink deep into every heart. "REPENT AND BE BAPTIZED EVERY ONE OF YOU IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST, FOR THE REMISSION OF YOUR SINS, AND YOU SHALL RECEIVE THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST. * * * * * Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them, (that is, unto the elect of God), about three thousand souls."

Thus, my friends, on that day were about three thousand persons elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, that is, according to a plan of which God had knowledge before it was sealed by the blood of his Son. And we now say to you, one and all, that you may all become the elect of God on the same terms. God is not a respecter of persons; all who will, may come and take the waters of life freely.

Having now seen that the scriptures which are generally relied on to prove the doctrine of unconditional and eternal election, have no reference whatever to that doctrine; that they treat of other subjects; and that consequently that doctrine has no support in the oracles of eternal truth, we shall proceed to offer a few arguments in favor of the views which we entertain on this subject, and then close this discourse.

1. The first argument we shall offer to prove that all men may be saved, is drawn from the parable of the talents, recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. Commencing at the fourteenth verse, we read as follows: "For the kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country, who called his own servants and delivered unto them his goods. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to

another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey." We are informed by this witness of our divine Lord, that "after a long time the Lord of these servants cometh and reckoneth with them." Unto two of them he said, "*enter into the joy of thy Lord;*" but concerning the third he said, "*take the talent from him, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*"

Now we ask, why was this difference made? Was it because the Lord of these servants had from all eternity chosen two of them to be participants of his joy, while he passed by the other? No, my friends; the difference in their condition was made upon a more righteous principle. It was because the first occupied until their Lord came. They were busily engaged in doing his will; and hence he said unto them, "WELL DONE, good and faithful servants. *You have been faithful over a few things, I will make you rulers over many things.*" But the other buried his Lord's money in the earth, and spent his time in idleness; he did not obey his Lord, and hence he was declared to be a wicked and unprofitable servant, and for this wickedness he was cast into outer darkness.

Now, all this means something; and we ask, what is it intended to teach? The Saviour answers: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto" this. That is, this represents God's manner of dealing with the children of men. All are his servants; he has made of one blood, all nations that dwell upon the face of the whole earth. And he has given to all talents to be occupied in his service; and all who do occupy according to his will, shall enter into eternal joys in heaven; while those who "refuse and rebel, shall be destroyed, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

2. Our second argument is the fact that salvation is offered in the Scriptures to all. When the angel appeared to the

shepherds in Bethlehem's fields, he said unto them "fear not, for behold we bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people."

This has reference to the great salvation offered in the Gospel, which Christ had now come to prepare; and from the language of the angel, it is certain that God designed that this salvation should be offered unto all people. But if a part of the human family had been passed by in the councils of grace, and in consequence of that fact, they could have no part in this salvation, I ask, how could the Saviour's birth be good news to all people?

When the Lord had finished the work of teaching and suffering which he came to do, just before he ascended up on high, he said unto his disciples, "thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," Luke xxiv, 46, 47. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark xvi, 16. From these scriptures you see, that it is the will of God, set forth in the command of Christ his son, that the glad news of salvation should be preached among all nations, and to every intelligent creature; that repentance is enjoined upon all, and remission of sins promised to all who obey.

Now if there is a portion of our race for whom this salvation was never provided, then this whole procedure is nothing but solemn mockery. It would be more consistent with the character of the good Lord, for him to steal away the elect from our world, and take them to glory, without letting those whom he passed by, know that any beings in the universe fared better than they. But, instead of this, angels are dispatched from the high courts of glory, to announce

the glad news of salvation to men, assuring them that it was to be unto *all men:* and we find the Saviour enjoining no secrecy upon his disciples on this subject; nay, he even commands them to proclaim the glad news among all nations, and to all people; and hence we conclude that all may become the elect of God, and enjoy this salvation if they will.

3. Our third argument is drawn from the mercy and goodness of God. That the Lord God is abundant in mercy and goodness, is taught throughout both Testaments.

Now, my friends, what would you say of a father who would make ample provision for all the wants of a part of his children, and pass by the rest while in a state of helplessness, and leave them to starve in his sight? You would all condemn him as a monster in human form. And shall we attribute such conduct to the merciful Lord? God has made of one blood all nations that dwell on the face of the whole earth; and shall we say that he has provided for all the spiritual wants of a part of this great family, and that he has passed by the remaining portion, and left them to perish in their sins, without providing any means for their recovery!! That he has made no provision for their salvation, but that they are left to perish as a matter of dire necessity! All the finer feelings of the human heart revolt at the very thought. It can not be that God has thus dealt with his creature, man. His mercy and goodness forbid such an idea.

4. As a fourth argument, we state the fact that Christ died for all. In proof of this declaration we read the following scriptures: "We see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man," Heb. iii, 9. "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ

Jesus, who gave himself a ranson for all to be testified in due time," 1 Tim. ii, 5, 6. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world," 1 John ii, 1, 3. "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them and rose again," 2 Cor. v, 14, 16.

From these scriptures it is clear that Christ died alike for all men; and hence we come to the irresistible conclusion that all may receive the same benefits from his death, on the same terms. If some may obtain remission of sins and adoption into the family of God by faith in the blood of Christ, all may. If the blood of sprinkling which Christ shed on Calvary, speaketh better things than the blood of Abel, it speaks these better things for all. If it speaks pardon for any, it speaks pardon for all, on the same terms.

5. We argue in the fifth place, that all may come to Christ, obtain pardon, and thus become the elect of God, from the fact that the invitations of the Bible embrace all mankind. God says, "look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth," Is. xlv, 22. "Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money come," Is. lv, 1, 2, 3. "As I live saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die, O house of Israel," Ez. xxxiii, 11. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. xi, 28. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink," John vii, 37. "The Spirit and the bride say, come; and let him that heareth say come;

and let him that is athirst, come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely," Rev. xxii, 17

You must see, my friends, that these invitations embrace all men. The ends of the earth are invited, by which we understand the vilest of the vile; the wicked are invited; the weary and heavy laden are invited; the thirsty are invited; and whosoever will come are made welcome to come and take salvation's waters without money, and without price. You can not imagine any class or condition of men who are not fully embraced in these invitations, excepting the lost.

Now if there are some of our race for whom these blessings were never intended, then has God mocked the miseries of men, by inviting them to come and partake of blessings which he determined they never should enjoy. Who—who is prepared to bring such an accusation against the Lord of hosts? Who is willing to face the LORD JEHOVAH, with such an imputation upon his lips?

6. But in conclusion, we remark, that the fact that God has appointed a day of general judgment, goes to establish the doctrine for which we are now contending. When Paul stood in the midst of Mars Hill, before the Athenian Areopagus, he said, "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead," Acts xvii, 31. And Christ and all his apostles teach that we shall be judged according to our works.

The Saviour says, "all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." How can this be reconciled with the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election and passing by? If the eternal destiny of all men was

unalterably fixed before the beginning of time, why judge the world? Why does the good Lord teach us that we shall all be rewarded or punished according to our works, if our eternal doom was predetermined before we were born? God has not thus delt with his creature man. His promises and threatenings are all made in sincerity; they mean what they say, and shall all be realized by every one according to his works. To those who by a patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, he will give eternal life; but unto those who are contentious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, he will give tribulation and wrath. (See Rom., second chapter).

Let all those then who have named the name of the Lord, be careful to depart from iniquity. O let us give all diligence to make our calling and election sure. Let us be careful to do his commandments, that we may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

And to those who have not submitted to the law of Christ, we would say, COME. You may all become the elect of God by faith and obedience. O then, fly to the Saviour while you may. Repent of all your past sins, forsake the evil of your ways, confess the Lord and Saviour before men, and be baptized in his holy name, and arise to walk in newness of life, and thus be added to the number of God's elect; and then go on to add to your faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, that an admittance may finally be administered unto you into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

SERMON X.

BAPTISM.

Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Acts ii, 38.

When I commenced writing discourses for this book, I hardly expected to have a sermon on baptism in it. My only reason for hesitating on the subject was, the fruitfulness of the theme. To discuss the subject of baptism at full length would require an entire book, of larger dimensions than this volume. How, then, could I think of writing a discourse of a few pages upon a subject requiring such extensive investigation? My object in publishing this little volume is to do good; hence, I desired to fill a great portion of its pages with matters pertaining to the order, piety and practice of Christians, and to the conversion of sinners. But, as baptism occupies a very prominent place in the gospel, and stands intimately connected with several subjects herein discussed, and as many brethren, whose judgments merit respect, think that the book should contain at least one discourse on this important ordinance, I have consented. But my design is to abridge and condense, as much as I possibly can, to do the subject anything like justice.

I have called baptism an important ordinance, and to this no one surely will object. An ordinance ordained by Jesus

Christ, by whom, and for whom, the universe was made, and by whom all things consist, must be important. Hence it is, that this subject has engaged the pens, the heads, and the feelings of the purest hearts, and the most towering intellects among the sons of men. May I not, then, in my humble way, say something upon the subject for the benefit of those who have not the means nor time to obtain and examine larger works upon this ordinance?

The subject of baptism seems naturally to divide itself into three heads—namely, the subject, the action, the design. Then I propose the following as the order of this discourse:

I. Show who is, according to the New Testament, a proper subject of baptism—who may of right be baptized.

II. Show what is the proper action, or mode of baptism; the thing to be done when a person is baptized.

III. Speak of the purpose and design for which persons are to be baptized.

I. According to this order, let us now proceed to examine into the proper subject of baptism. And here we are met with differences of opinion and practice, at the very commencement of our investigation. Some contend that a believer in Jesus Christ only is a proper subject for baptism, while others hold that the infants of believing parents may and ought to be baptized. The former is our view—the latter is the view of many of our highly-respected religious neighbors. I believe that some baptize infants whether their parents are believers or not.

Now, this is no small difference of opinion, and the difference of practice growing out of these two views of the subject is very great. Now, as baptism is an ordinance of divine appointment, we should be very certain that we observe it according to the will of God; our will should not be consulted in the case.

That we are right in our views and practice, on this point, so far as we go, is admitted by all. That a true believer in Christ is a proper subject of baptism, no one denies; but some of our good neighbors go farther, and say that infants also should be baptized, and charge us with an omission of duty for neglecting the baptism of our little ones. Now, we all ought to desire to know the truth on this point. If our neighbors are correct, we must be living in sin, as individuals, and as a church, for neglecting so important a duty. But if we are right, our neighbors are wrong, and must surely be guilty before the heavens for performing so solemn an act in the awful name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which God has never authorized! O, what a solemn thought.

Now, occupying the position we do, we have nothing to prove—our views being admitted; but those who go further, and practice infant baptism, stand on controverted ground; hence, the burden of proof falls on them. They say they are right; we doubt it, and call for the proof, and they are bound to give it. Well, they give what they consider evidence sufficient to justify them in the practice, and also to bring us to yield the point, and adopt their practice. But it is our province to carefully examine their proofs and arguments, which we will now proceed to do as briefly as possible.

1. "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Matt. xix, 14. This scripture is often referred to as favoring infant baptism; but why it should be, I can not tell, since baptism is not mentioned in the text nor in the context.

Is it argued that they should be baptized because Jesus said, *of such is the kingdom of heaven?* We answer, that no person was ever commanded, either by Christ or his apostles to be baptized because he was fit for the kingdom

of heaven. But is it argued that as the Saviour manifested so much regard for them, they should be baptized? I answer, his example only shows that parents should highly esteem their children, and "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." But is the proof in the expression, "forbid them not to come unto me"? So I have heard it argued. Say they, Jesus says, "Suffer little children to come unto me," and how can they come to Christ in any other way than in baptism? And, strange as it may appear, after some of these very teachers say that there is no other way for an infant to come to Christ except in baptism, they will treat very lightly the idea of an adult coming to Christ in baptism! If we should call on sinners to come to the Lord in baptism, they would say that we trust in water for salvation. O, consistency! thou art a jewel.

The *coming to Christ*, however, named in this scripture, was not a moral coming, and hence it is said, they brought "little children to him, that he should put his hands on them and pray." V. 13. Yes, they were not brought to be baptized, but that Jesus might touch them and bless them; "and he took them up in his arms, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them." Mark x, 16. Now, shall we conclude, that because Jesus embraced and pronounced a blessing upon children while he was here in person, therefore we may—nay, ought to—baptize unconscious babes at the present time? If he had intended this to be done, he surely would have given plainer instruction than this upon the subject. This proof text then fails to sustain the practice. So we remain as we were.

2. Christ said to Peter, "Feed my sheep, and feed my lambs." John xxi, 15, 16. This address to Peter has been pressed into the service of infant baptism; but it will require some explaining to enable the reader to see the point

in the argument. Those who use this argument reason thus: The fold of Christ is the church; the sheep are the adult members, and the lambs are their children. Then it is assumed that the church is the right place to feed the sheep and their lambs—hence, the lambs must come into the church in order to be fed. But baptism is the door into the church, therefore infants must be baptized. I admit that this is a very circuitous argument—that it is going a long way round to get a little proof; but such as it is, you now have before you.

Now, before this argument proves anything at all in favor of the practice under consideration, it must be assumed that those who are regarded by the Lord as his sheep, are such by nature, and that, therefore, their offspring are his lambs by their natural relationship to their parents! Or, will it be argued that the children of Christians are born Christians? Then they need not be *born again* in order to inherit the kingdom of God! It will not do to say that they are to be baptized to constitute them the lambs of the fold, for that would destroy the whole argument. The Lord did not say, Make sheep and lambs, and then feed them.

How often have I heard those who do not baptize their infants, charged with feeding and taking care of the old sheep, while they leave the dear little lambs out in the desert, without food, and exposed to all the beasts of prey that prowl through the wilderness of sin. And then they will turn round and say that these same children are all sinners by nature, totally depraved, and subject to the wrath of God!!

No, dear reader, no person is regarded as one of the Lord's sheep—as belonging to the fold of Christ, the flock of God—who has not been born again—"born from above, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word

of God, which liveth and abideth forever." 1 Pet. i, 23. And the sheep mean Christians of age and experience, and the lambs mean young converts, who have just enlisted in the cause of Christ, and who are capable of being fed with the "sincere milk of the word, that they may grow thereby." 1 Peter ii, 2. Infants are not capable of being thus fed, and therefore they are not referred to in this command.

3. The apostolic commission has been pressed into the service of infant baptism. Jesus said: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. xxviii, 19. Now, say our friends, here is a command to baptize all nations, and infants constitute a portion of the nations; and hence, those who only baptize adults, fail to comply with the whole command, and are therefore guilty of the sin of omission.

But the Saviour also said, *Teach all nations*, and hence they are guilty of the same sin, according to their own showing, for not teaching the infant in its mother's arms, the great principles of Christianity. But the fact that saps the very foundation of this argument, is that the *teaching* goes before the *baptizing*, and hence, no man is authorized by this command of Christ to baptize any person who has not first been taught the way of salvation through the death of Christ.

But when our friends have seen the leanness of this argument, they have taken shelter in the original. They say that μαθητευσατε, which is here translated *teaching*, means to disciple, or *make disciples;* and that this is to be done by baptizing them. But what does this word *disciple* mean? Webster defines it thus: "A learner, a scholar, one who receives, or professes to receive instruction from another; 2, a follower, an adherent to the doctrines of another." When used as a verb, he defines it: "to teach, to train or

bring up; 2, to make disciples, to convert to doctrines or principles." Then no one is a disciple of Christ until he becomes a learner, and professes to receive the teaching and instruction of Christ; and no one is capable of being *discipled* until he is capable of being converted to the doctrine or principles of Christ, or of his holy religion. Then, and only then, may they be baptized according to the great commission given to the apostles. But I must not dwell.

4. The language of Peter, uttered on the day of Pentecost, to encourage the condemned, weeping multitude, when overwhelmed with guilt, has been thought to favor infant baptism. "The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts ii, 39. Because Peter said the promise is to your children, immediately after commanding them to be baptized, it is supposed that children should be baptized. But he did not say the *command* is to your children, but the *promise*. And even if he had so said, unconscious babes could not have complied with it, for they were commanded to *repent*, as well as to be baptized, which infants could not do.

I suppose that all will admit that *the promise* here referred to was the promise made to Abraham—"In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Gen. xxii, 18. By saying this promise was to them, he meant those then present; by their children, he meant their descendants; and by all that are afar off, he meant the Gentile world. Nothing, then, in favor of infant baptism yet.

5. Household baptisms are next appealed to for evidence in favor of infant baptism. This argument stands thus: Whole households were baptized: we suppose there were infants in these families, and if there were, they were baptized—and if they were baptized, infants ought to be baptized now. This is giving the argument all that is

claimed for it, for no one will say positively that there were infants in these families. They only suppose that there were, because we often find families with infants in them.

Now, we take the other side of the question and say, we suppose there were no infants in these families; and if there were not, then infants were not baptized on these occasions; and if infants were not baptized then, infants ought not to be baptized now. Thus, the reader will see that so far we stand on equal ground. We each have one *supposition*, two *ifs*, and one *conclusion*.

Now, let us examine these cases, and see whose supposition, ifs, and conclusion, the facts favor most. There are only three of these cases, namely: the household of Lydia, of the Jailor, and of Stephanus. In the case of Lydia, all the probabilities are against the idea of there being any infants in her household, which the reader will easily see by examining the case carefully, as it is recorded in the sixteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Lydia was of the city of Thyatira, which was some three hundred and fifty miles from Philippi; she was a seller of purple, for the manufacture of which article the women of Lydia, the province in which Thyatira was situated, were celebrated. She seems to have been sojourning in Philippi at this time for the purpose of selling her merchandise, and of course had her house of temporary abode.

Now, it is not reasonable that she would have been cumbered with small children while thus engaged. This fact is in favor of our supposition.

But she appears to have had no husband. No mention is made of her husband in the whole history of the case. She appears to be the sole governess of the house. She said to Paul and Silas, "If ye have *judged me* to be faithful to the Lord, come into *my* house, and abide there." If she had had a husband, she should have said, Come into

our house, and abide. But she said *my house*, which shows that she had the supreme control of her household affairs. This fact, then, is opposed to the idea of there being any infants in her family.

But, at the conclusion of the chapter, it is said that "they entered into the house of Lydia, and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed." Then, the members of her household were brethren, capable of receiving comfort from the advice and instruction of the apostle, which shows beyond a doubt that they were not infants.

Let us now look at the jailor's household. After this family was baptized, it is said, "he brought them (Paul and Silas) into his house, and set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." V. 34. Then this entire family rejoiced; they all believed in God; hence, there were no infants in this household.

We next turn to the household of Stephanus. In 1 Corinthians, i, 16, Paul informs us that he baptized this family. In 1 Corinthians xvi, 15, he says that this household was "the first fruits of Achaia;" so they must have been baptized on the occasion named in Acts xviii, where it is said, that many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized. In 1 Corinthians xvi, 15, Paul says, that this household had "addicted, themselves to the ministry of the saints." Now, according to the chronological notes which Dr. A. Clarke has placed at the head of the chapters in his Commentary, it was only two years from the time that the Corinthians believed and were baptized, to the writing of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. I ask, then, could there have been any infants in this family? Could infants, in two years from their baptism, have gained such notoriety by their benevolent contributions to the poor saints, as to have merited an apostolic commendation?

Surely not. All the facts, then, in this case, stand opposed to the supposition that there were infants in this household at the time of their baptism.

Then the reader will perceive, that all the facts and circumstances, in every case where family baptisms are named, are in favor of our supposition, and hence, that they afford no evidence whatever, in favor of infant baptism.

6. 1 Corinthians, vii, 14, has sometimes been brought forward in favor of infant baptism: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean: but now are they holy." It is true that baptism is not named in this connection; hence the unprejudiced must consider the advocates of the practice we are now examining, hard pressed for proof, when they resort to this passage for evidence to prove infant baptism. This argument is short, and runs thus: Infants are holy, and therefore should be baptized.

But John Wesley says they are unholy, and therefore ought to be baptized! How doctors will differ! In reply to this argument, I need only say, that no person is ever commanded to be baptized because he is holy: holiness is never required in the gospel as a prerequisite in order to baptism. Thus, this argument falls.

7. Circumcision is made an argument in favor of infant baptism. This argument has many points in it. It is rather a three-fold argument, but still it is easily broken, when brought to the touch of Bible truth. It runs thus: The covenant on which the Jewish church and the Christian church are organized, is the same covenant; hence, the Jewish church and the Christian church is the same church. Infants were members of the church, under the Jewish dispensation, and therefore they should be members of the

church under the Christian dispensation. Infants were initiated into the Jewish church by circumcision, and baptism came in the room of circumcision; therefore, infants should be initiated into the Christian church by baptism.

The reader must be ready to say, this is going a long way for a little proof. So it seems to me, and there is no proof in it, at last.

If the reader will turn back, and carefully peruse the first sermon in this book, I need say but little more to him in reference to the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches; nor in reference to the identity of the old and new covenants. To show that these congregational organisms are not identical, I will only add one argument to what will be found in the discourse just referred to. Of those who were baptized on the day of Pentecost, it is said, "they eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily, such as should be saved: or, as John Wesley renders it, "the Lord added daily to the church those who were saved." Now all these belonged to the Jewish national church; and yet they were formally added to the Christian church, which shows as clear as a sunbeam, that these *two* are *not one.*

In reference to the covenants on which these churches were organized, Paul reasons thus: "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. * * * In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Heb. viii, 7-13. Yes, it has vanished away, and all its rites and ceremonies, circumcision and all, are gone with it, unless

reënacted in the new institution. But we find no such enacting clause.

On another occasion, Paul reasons thus: "It is written that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants: the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai, in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all. * * * * Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But, as then, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless, what saith the scripture?" Reader, attention: hear what the scripture says: "*Cast out the bond-woman.*" And is this all? No. "*Cast out her son,*" also, "*for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman.* So, then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free." Gal. iv, 22-31.

Here is a fair, full, and complete refutation of the whole theory and practice of infant church-membership, and infant baptism.

In this allegory, according to Paul's reasoning, Hagar, Abraham's bond-woman, represents the old covenant, and Ishmael represents the adherents of that covenant, or the members of the Jewish national church, built upon that covenant. Sarah represents the new covenant; and Isaac is a figure of the adherents of the new covenant, or the members of the Christian church organized upon it. As Ishmael, "who was born after the flesh," that is, according to the natural course of things, persecuted Isaac, who was,

by promise, produced above the ordinary laws of nature—so the members of that old Jewish church, in Paul's day, persecuted the members of the Christian church. But the apostle asked the question, "What saith the scripture?" The answer is, "Cast out the bond-woman and her son, for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman." That is, cast out the covenant and its adherents; cast out the constitution, and all the members of that national church which was organized upon it. Yes, cast them all out, for the two shall not inherit together. That is, the members of the old Jewish church shall not become members of the Christian church, because of their relation to the old covenant, or its ceremonies.

"So, then," says Paul, "we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free." We, Christians, do not belong to the old covenant; we were not produced by it; but "we, as Isaac was, are the children of promise," brought forth by the new covenant, and stand upon it. Our title rests not in flesh and blood.

Now, how any one can, after reading Paul's reasoning in this 4th chapter of Galatians, contend for infant membership in the church of Jesus Christ, I can not tell; but it is still more strange how they can go to the old covenant and Jewish kingdom, for evidence in favor of their practice, after reading Paul's arguments against it. I say Paul's arguments against it; for the arguments of the apostle, in Hebrews and Galatians, were especially designed to show that these two covenants were not the same, and these churches were different organisms, so much so, that the members of the former should not be heirs with the members of the new, unless they be born again.

As to circumcision, I will only say, that the Bible no where says that baptism came in its stead. This should satisfy every honest person, who desires to be governed by

the will of God. If baptism came in the stead of circumcision, why did not the Lord, or some one of his apostles say so? This would have set the question at rest forever. If baptism came in the stead of circumcision, then it does for its subjects all that circumcision did for its subjects. Circumcision secured to all its subjects a title to the promised land, the land of Canaan. Does baptism do that for its subjects? Circumcision was only adminstered to males; where then is the law for baptising females? Do you say, in the New Testament? Then you give up the old covenant, and, to be consistent, should give up your *circumcision-argument* with it.

Paul says, "If you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing," Gal. v, 2. What shall we say then of those who receive this ordinance as a Jewish rite? as circumcision in a different form? But he goes still farther and says, "I testify to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." Then, if baptism is the same rite in another form, all who are baptized are under obligation to comply with all the rites and ceremonies of the law of Moses! Who is prepared for this?

But all the Jews who had been circumcised, were baptized when they believed in Christ. Then, to carry out the example, all who have been baptized in infancy, should, when they come to years, and believe in Christ, be baptized again. This is an important suggestion, and I hope it will not be passed over lightly. Let it be remembered, that all who baptize infants, profess to do it by the authority of the covenant made with Abraham; hence, their children are baptized by virtue of the same law that the children of the Jews were circumcised, and for the same purpose. My dear reader, were you thus baptized? Then you have become a debtor to do the whole law; Christ has profited

you nothing, while you remain where you are. But every child of Abraham who had been thus circumcised, when he believed in Christ as the Son of God and the Divine Saviour, renounced his old church standing, confessed his faith in Christ, and was baptized by His authority. Now, should not all follow this example? Having begun in the flesh, let them now be made perfect by the spirit.

But in conclusion, none of the apostles ever used the fact that baptism came in the room of circumcision, against the Judaising teachers, who were saying, that except the Gentile converts be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, they could not be saved. This certainly would have been the most effectual way of settling that dispute. Had the apostles said, now brethren, you are correct in your views of the importance of circumcision, but then, the Lord has changed this rite into baptism, and hence, these Gentile brethren have all received circumcision in its new form; how satisfactory such an argument would have been to all parties, had it been true. But the apostles never thus reasoned with these Judaisers; and why? Because they knew that no such charge had been made. They knew that these were two distinct ordinances, belonging to different covenants, and designed for very different purposes. Hence, instead of adopting the argument just alluded to, they attempted to convince these teachers, that circumcision, and the covenant to which it belonged, and by which it was regulated, had accomplished their purposes and died.

Thus it is seen, that all the arguments used to sustain the practice of infant baptism fail, and consequently, that there is no authority in the Bible for any such practice. This, of itself, is enough to make us hesitate, reflect, and even doubt the propriety of baptizing our children in infancy. Indeed, it is hardly necessary to offer arguments

against a practice in religion, for which there is no scripture authority. Still we are asked why we do not baptize our children; hence, I will give a few brief answers to this question.

1. There is no precept for it in all the writings of the apostles and prophets of the Old and New Testament.

To this it is replied,

1. There is no plain command for female communion, and yet we practice it. But what does this prove? Suppose there is no authority for female communion, and that we are wrong for practicing it; will that prove that infants ought to be baptized? Two *wrongs* never made one *right.*

But I do not admit that there is no authority for female communion. Let any one come as near proving the right of infants to baptism, as I can come to proving the right of females to the communion, and I will yield the point.

In the first chapter of Acts we are informed, that after the ascension of Christ, the disciples returned to Jerusalem, and went into an upper room, where all the apostles abode, who "all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, *with the women, and Mary*, the mother of Jesus." V. 13, 14. "The number of the names together was about one hundred and twenty." V. 15. Now, here we have one hundred and twenty disciples together, and among them are Mary, and other women. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all in one place." Acts ii, 1. That is, the one hundred and twenty, among whom are Mary and other women. "And they that gladly received Peter's word, were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." V. 41. That is, about three thousand were added to the one hundred and twenty. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." V. 42. Thus the

whole three thousand one hundred and twenty, women and all, continued in the breaking of bread, or in the communion of the Lord's Supper, and hence Christian women may do the same now.

In the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul gives special directions to the church, in reference to their devotional exercises, pointing out the duties of men and women, and closes by telling them the manner in which they should observe the Lord's Supper. There is no change in the address, so that all the advice in reference to the supper, applies to the women as well as to the men, showing that all were to partake. Here, then, is authority for female communion.

But it is replied, secondly, that infant circumcision had been enjoined, and practiced, and as baptism came in its stead, no such command was necessary.

But I answer, first, that we have just seen that there is no evidence that baptism did come in the room of circumcision; and that the facts, purposes and designs connected with these rites, show that such is not the case. Secondly, I reply, that adult circumcision was also enjoined and practiced, under the law; and hence, for the same reason, adult baptism need not to have been commanded—and yet it was. But, thirdly, the gospel was preached among the Gentiles, and thousands of them received it. These people had not lived under the law, and therefore had never been taught on the subject of circumcision, hence they should have been taught infant baptism, if the Lord intended it to be practiced. So this reply to our first reason for not baptizing infants, falls to the ground, and our reason still stands good.

2. Our next reason for our practice is, that there is no plain example of infant baptism in all the New Testament. When children are directly interested in an event recorded

in the apostolic writings, they are generally named. Example: "And they that had eaten, were about five thousand men, besides women and *children*." Matt. xiv, 21. "And they all brought us on our way, with wives and *children*." Acts xxi, 5. "But when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Acts viii, 12. What a beautiful place this would have been to put in children. And I ask, if they baptized the children, why are they not named? Was it of more importance to the world to know that children were miraculously fed, than to know that they were baptized? Was it of more interest to the church, as well as to the family of man generally, to know that children accompanied Paul, when he left the city of Tyre, a short distance, than to know that it is God's will that they should be baptized? No, dear reader, the only rational reason that can be given for the silence of the apostles on this subject, is that no cases of infant baptism occurred under their administration, and hence none are recorded.

3. My third reason for not baptizing infants—or, if you please, my third argument against the practice—is deduced from household baptisms. Yes, strange as the reader may think, I see strong arguments in these household baptisms against infant baptism. We have, in the New Testament, an account of the preaching of the apostles and evangelists, for about sixty years—in all Judea, Samaria, and among the Gentiles, throughout the then civilized world—but during all this labor, and travel, and preaching, for so long a time, we only read of three, or at most, of four cases, of whole families being baptized. Hence, it must have been a very unusual occurrence, and therefore, the divinely authorized penmen recorded these cases. If they had been in the practice of baptizing the infants of believing

parents, with the parents, we should have had household baptisms all the time; whereas, there are but three cases clearly stated. It is said, that "Crispus believed on the Lord, with all his house;" but it is not said that they were baptized—though they no doubt were—and if so, we have four cases, and only four, in all the New Testament, of household baptism. Now, I have baptized more whole families than this, with my own hands, and yet I never baptized an infant in my life.

4. We do not baptize our infants, because if we do, and make that valid, and then practice the "*one baptism*," we would take from our children the privilege of personal obedience to the command to be baptized. And who can express the real, heart-felt happiness, that is realized in obeying God in this institution, with an enlightened judgment, for myself—without any sponsors, or god-father, or god-mother, between me and the great Head of the church. This joy no one ever realizes, who relies upon his infant baptism.

5. Baptism does the child no good. Reader, would it do an adult any good to be baptized when sound asleep? Surely not. But how much more does the infant know of its baptism, than the man asleep?

6. But in conclusion on this point, the law of baptism authorizes the baptism of believers only, and thereby virtually forbids the baptism of any others. "Go,' said Jesus, "go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that *believeth* and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi, 15, 16. Believers, then, are to be baptized according to this law, and to baptize any others is going beyond law, and acting on our own responsibility. This we are not willing to do, lest we should be asked in the last day, *who hath required this at your hand?* and be found speechless.

I know that it has been said, that if we refuse to baptize infants, because they can not believe, then we must hold the doctrine of infant damnation; for the Saviour said, "he that believeth not shall be damned."

But we are not trying to settle a controversy with the Almighty. We are only investigating the arguments for and against infant baptism. That this law authorizes the baptism of believers, must be admitted by all. And if it teaches the damnation of infants, we are not accountable for it. But the Saviour did say, "he that believeth not shall be damned." And how do the advocates of infant baptism get out of the difficulty? They say that if infants can not believe, they are not embraced in this declaration, and are therefore saved through the merits of Christ, without faith. Very well. Now, just add, and *without baptism* also, and you will have it precisely right. No, reader, the Gospel was to be preached to those who have eyes to see, ears to hear, and hearts to understand and believe. And those who do believe with all their hearts, and none others, are to be baptized.

II. Having now ascertained who may be baptized, we proceed to examine the action of baptism. Or, as it is commonly termed, the mode of this ordinance. This is also a controverted point. Good and great men have different views as to the thing to be done when persons are baptized. Some say that the subject of this ordinance should be immersed in water; others say the water should be sprinkled on the subject; while a third class contend for pouring the water. The two views last named, however, differ so little, that the friends of each make a common cause of it, and give their mode of baptism a common name, that is, affusion. So we need only consider these two actions, immersion and affusion.

1. First, let us look at the arguments adduced in favor of

sprinkling and pouring; for on the subject of immersion there is no dispute; all admit the validity of that mode. Hence the course of argument pursued by the advocates of affusion, is rather singular. They first admit that baptism by immersion, all other things being equal, is valid. But then they say that this is not the only valid mode; that affusion is also valid. Then, having assumed that affusion is *a mode* of baptism, their future course of argumentation, is to make it appear that persons were baptized in the days of the apostles under circumstances which rendered immersion impossible, and hence, in these cases, they conclude it must have been performed by affusion.

1. The first case of this sort that I will notice, is the number baptized on the day of Pentecost. Here, say they, were three thousand persons baptized in one day, or in a part of a day. Now, says the arguist, it would have been impossible to immerse so many persons in so short a time, hence they must have been baptized by sprinkling or pouring. But this is taking for granted the very thing to be proven, namely, that affusion is a mode of baptism. I have so far used the phrase *mode of baptism*, simply because our friends on the other side of this question use that form of expression. We wish it, however, to be distinctly understood and remembered, that there is no such form of speech in the New Testament. Hence, we do not adopt the phrase as our own; we discard it, as without authority, and only use it in accommodation to those whose practice we are examining. With this explanation let us return to the subject.

Three thousand could not have been immersed on the day of Pentecost: therefore they must have been sprinkled. But suppose sprinkling is not baptism, then what follows? But let us examine the case. There were twelve apostles present on this occasion; all authorized to baptize. Now divide three thousand by twelve, and we have two hundred and

fifty persons for each one to baptize. Peter's address commenced about nine o'clock, A. M., for he said, "it is only the third hour of the day." The Jews divided the day into twelve equal parts, calling each an hour. So when the days were long, their hours were long, and when the days were short, their hours were short. So the third hour of the day was the middle of the forenoon, say nine o'clock A. M. Now suppose Peter preached — shall I say one hour? From all that appears in the account given in Acts, second chapter, we would not suppose that his speech lasted more than thirty minutes. But to give all the weight to the argument, that any one would ask, we will suppose that three hours were spent in preaching and arranging for this baptism. This leaves six hours in which to baptize. Well, two hundred and fifty divided by six, gives forty-one and a fraction, the number for each to baptize per hour. Now, where is the impossibility? Surely one person can immerse forty-two persons per hour.

But it should be remembered that there were eighty-two ordained preachers somewhere. Is it not likely they were all present on this interesting occasion? Where would you expect to find the seventy preachers whom Christ ordained, but among the hundred and twenty that were "all in one place with one accord?" And would they not have engaged in the work of baptizing if circumstances required it? Reason says they would. This, then, would only have given thirty-six and a fraction, for each one to baptize during the six hours; a little over six to the hour. So this mighty impossibility vanishes into thin air, when we make the proper calculation.

2. The next example which is supposed to present a difficulty in the way of immersion, and therefore to favor affusion, is the baptism of Saul, afterward called Paul. It is assumed that he was baptized standing on his feet, and

therefore could not have been immersed; and hence, he must have been baptized by sprinkling or pouring.

This whole argument rests on the fact that Ananias said to him, "*arise and be baptized.*" Acts xxii, 16. But this fact does not prove that he was baptized standing. Indeed this very circumstance is in favor of his immersion; for he could have been sprinkled without arising, but he could not have been immersed without it. This is going to the wrong place to find sprinkling.

But Paul tells us how he was baptized. He says, "we have been buried with Him by baptism," Rom. vi, 4. I put *buried* in the the past time, because *sunetapheemen* is in the aorist, which "expresses a *transient past* action." Here Paul uses the personal pronoun of the first person, plural number, *we*. The first person denotes the speaker: Paul was the speaker. So, then, Paul and all his brethren at Rome, "*were buried by baptism.*" This puts the question at rest — Paul was buried, or immersed, when he was baptized, he himself being witness in the case.

3. The baptism of the Israelites unto Moses, is supposed to favor affusion. Paul says, they "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," 1 Cor. x, 2. But in the history of the case it is said, "they passed through the Red sea as by dry land," Heb. xi, 29. Here, say they, is a case of *dry land*, or dry shod baptism. Then to make out the case, they suppose that the cloud rained upon them, or that the spray from the heaps of water on either side fell upon them, and this is what Paul calls a baptism. In proof of the first supposition, Ps. lxvii, 17, is referred to: "The clouds poured out water; the skies sent out a sound; thine arrows also went forth."

1. But I answer first, that if this heavy rain fell while the Israelites were passing through the sea, it could not be said that "*they went into the midst of the sea upon the dry*

ground," for the rain would have wet the ground. Exodus xiv, 22.

2. This cloud was not a raining cloud. It was a cloud of darkness unto the Egyptians, but it gave light to the Israelites. Ex. xiv, 20. It was doubtless of the nature of the fiery cloud that Moses saw in the burning bush.

3. But this mighty storm occurred after the Israelites had passed over; and while the Egyptians were following them. Then it was, that "with the blast of thy nostrils the waters were gathered together." "Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them." Ex. xv, 8, 10.

As to the second supposition, that the spray from the walls of water fell upon them, this was impossible, for they were frozen. Moses says, "the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea." Ex. xv, 8.

Now I do not believe that one drop of water touched the hosts of Israel, while passing through the Red sea. Paul says, "they were under the cloud and passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," 1 Cor. x, 1, 2. So the cloud and sea were both employed in their baptism. "The waters were a wall unto them, on their right hand, and on their left," Ex. xiv, 22. And the cloud was over them, so they were completely covered up, and concealed from the view of their enemies. Thus being completely overwhelmed by the *cloud and sea;* at the same time, taking Moses for their commander and leader, Paul calls it a baptism unto Moses.

4. The baptism of the jailer and his family, has been supposed to afford some evidence in favor of affusion. To make this appear, it is first asserted that they were baptized in the house; and then it is supposed that they could not have been immersed in the house, hence they must have been baptized by sprinkling or pouring. Now, no one, I am sure,

will say that this is not a fair representation of the argument.

1. To this I answer, first, that even if they were baptized in the house, this would not prove that they were not immersed. Baths for bathing were common in that country. I have baptized in a house, and did it by immersion too.

2. But they were not baptized in the jailer's house, as I will now show. It seems the house in which the keeper of the prison resided, was so connected with the prison, that the jailer could see from his room that the prison doors were open. Paul could also see into the jailer's room, for when he was about to kill himself, "Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, do thyself no harm, for we are all here," Acts xvi, 28. "Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out." Verses 29, 30.

Now I ask, where were they? In the jailer's house, for it is said, "they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to *all that were in his house.*" Verse 32. "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Verse 33. Now, where did he take them? I answer, *out of the house;* for after this he "brought them into his house, and set meat before them." Verse 34. Now, it is impossible to bring a person into a house *twice*, without his *going out once.* Paul and Silas were brought into the jailer's house once; there they preached until the people believed. Then they *were taken*, had their stripes dressed, and baptized these converts, and then were *brought into this house* again. And the reader will notice that the baptizing was done between the first and second time that they were brought into this house. Then the baptizing was not done in the house, and so the argument falls, if it be lawful to call it an argument.

But, I ask, why take them out of the house, if this baptism was to be performed by sprinkling? This whole procedure looks very much like our practice. We preach to the people in the house until they believe, and desire to obey the Lord. Then we *take them* to where there is water sufficient, and baptize them, and then they return to their house, and rejoice, believing in God.

To these plain facts it has been objected that, if Paul and Silas had been out to the river baptizing folks that night, they acted hypocritically next morning, when they refused to go out without a legal release. But let it be remembered that the charge to the jailer was, "KEEP THEM SAFELY." This he did, and even while he was being baptized, Paul and Silas were in his custody. They did not *go out* that night—they were *taken*, and that by the keeper of the prison himself.

5. Heb. ix, 10, has been employed in favor of baptism by affusion. Speaking of the Jewish institution, Paul says it "stood in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances imposed on them, until the time of reformation." Now, I know it will require a good deal of explaining to get the reader to see any argument in this scripture in favor of the practice which I am considering. But we wish to give the argument its full force, and therefore will explain. The word which is here translated *washings*, is *baptismois* in the original—*divers baptisms*. The Jews sprinkled on various occasions. Hence, it is supposed that when Paul here speaks of their divers baptisms, he refers to these sprinklings. Now, this is the whole argument, fairly explained.

1. My first reply to this is, that the Jews also practiced divers immersions, or bathings, and who knows but that Paul here refers to them? I should think this is the most likely. At least this fact destroys the argument.

2. But I reply, secondly, that Paul refers to the Jewish sprinklings in the context, thus: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer, *sprinkling* the unclean," etc., v. 13. Now, what word is here employed? When the apostle speaks of these Jewish sprinklings, does he use the word *baptismois?* No, gentle reader, he here employs the word *rantizousa*, from *rantizo*, which means to sprinkle. Now, if by *baptismois*, in the tenth verse, he meant Jewish sprinklings, I ask, in the name of reason and Christian candor, why did he drop that word, and adopt the word *rantizousa*, when he names these sprinklings? This fact refutes the whole argument—if it deserves the name of argument.

3. But in conclusion, on this point, I state the fact that Dr. McKnight, with all his predilections in favor of sprinkling, translates *baptismois*, in this case, IMMERSIONS.

6. The next argument employed to sustain sprinkling, which I will notice, is taken from spiritual baptism. Jesus said to his disciples, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Acts i, 5. Now, the Holy Spirit is often spoken of as being poured out, and shed forth upon the people. This is said to be the fulfillment of the above promise. So, when persons are baptized with the Holy Spirit, the Spirit is poured upon them. Now, say our friends, water baptism should be performed in the same way—that is, the water should be sprinkled or poured upon the subject.

1. My first answer to this is, that when the impartation of the Holy Spirit is called a baptism, it means more than the ordinary reception of the Spirit. Before Jesus made the promise quoted above, "He breathed upon them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." John xx, 22. But still they were not baptized with the Spirit. This promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, which was, doubtless, the

day referred to; the Lord said, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." When they were baptized according to this promise, "they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts ii, 4.

This same kind of baptism was performed upon the Gentiles at the opening of the gospel kingdom to the Gentile world. Hence, it is said: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost; for they heard them SPEAK WITH TONGUES, AND MAGNIFY GOD." Acts x, 44, 45, 46. This miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit, Peter afterwards called a baptism, when he said: "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Acts xi, 16. Thus it is clear, that when the gift of the Holy Spirit is called a baptism, it means more than the enjoyment of the Spirit as a comforter. It is an overwhelming of the whole person with the miraculous influence of the Spirit. It was not the manner of the Spirit's coming that is called baptism; but the bringing of the whole person—soul, body and spirit—under its influence, after it had come. This Spirit was in heaven, and had to descend before the disciples could be baptized with it. I have often baptized persons with water that was poured out, or shed forth, or sprinkled down, but it was not the sprinkling that baptized these persons, but it was my putting them under, or immersing them in the water after it had come down, that constituted the baptism.

2. But my second reply is, that the preposition in the Greek is *en*, which literally means *in*—"Ye shall be baptized *in* the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Then if

water baptism must be performed in the same way, persons must be baptized in water, which clearly indicates an immersion.

7. "So shall he sprinkle many nations." Isaiah lii, 15. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." Ezekiel xxxvi, 25. These scriptures are referred to as affording strong evidence in favor of baptism by sprinkling. In reply to the first, I notice:

1. That the particle *so* shows the manner of doing the thing that is here called sprinkling. And to what does that little word refer? Read what goes before: "As many were astonished at thee; (his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men); *so shall he sprinkle* many nations." Now, reader, don't you see something very awkward in this? How is it, that by having his visage and form so marred, and bruised, and beaten, he could sprinkle the nations? You see this sprinkling is not to be done with water, but by having his form thus marred.

Now, instead of *sprinkle*, read *astonish*, and the difficulty is removed, and the passage harmonizes with itself, and with the facts referred to in this prophecy.

So Taylor Hinton understands the word, and says, in reference to the common version: "This is entirely a mistranslation—the Hebrew word signifying to *astonish*, *startle*, or *surprise*, as when a man has water suddenly dashed into his face."—*His. Bap.*, *p.* 159. The sense of the passage is, that many should be astonished at the sufferings of Christ, when they consider how his visage is marred, even more than any of the sons of men.

2. In reference to the passage quoted from Ezekiel, I have only to say that it has not yet been fulfilled. It refers to the Jews alone, and refers to the time when they shall be gathered to the land of their fathers. Dr. Clark comments

upon this passage thus: "*Then* (at the time of this great restoration) *will I sprinkle clean water upon you.* The *truly cleansing water;* the influence of the HOLY SPIRIT typified by *water,* whose property is to *cleanse, whiten, purify, refresh,* render *healthy* and *fruitful.*" At the close he says; "I do not ask my reader's pardon for having considered this most beautiful chapter as relating not to the restoration from the Babylonish captivity, but to the redemption under the new covenant by Jesus the Christ." Thus it appears that these scriptures have no reference to Christian baptism whatever. Indeed, they are never referred to by the New Testament writers in connection with this ordinance.

When, by the edict of Herod, the children in all the coasts of Bethlehem were slain, it is said, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah, the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard; lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning; Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, for they were not." Matt. ii, 17, 18. "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, He shall be called a Nazarene." Matt. ii, 23. "For these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And, again, another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced." John xix, 36, 37. "And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots; *that it might be fulfilled* which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." Matt. xxvii, 35. Thus were these inspired penmen in the constant habit of referring to the prophecies and noting their fulfillment. Why did they not thus refer to Isaiah lii, 15, and Ezekiel xxxvi, 25? Why did they not say, Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, that it

might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, I will sprinkle clean water upon you? And many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, So shall he sprinkle many nations? Simply because they knew that these scriptures did not refer to baptism.

Now, I have examined all the main arguments used to sustain affusion, and found them all to fail, utterly fail, to give any support to that theory and practice. I need, then, say but little in favor of immersion; for if baptism by affusion is not a scriptural practice, of course immersion is, this mode being admitted by all. Still, that I may, as far as the limits allotted to this discourse will allow, do justice to the subject, I will present a few arguments on the affirmative side of this question.

1. The places where baptism was performed indicate immersion to have been the mode. "Then went out to him (John) Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the regions round about, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Matt. iii, 5, 6. "And John also was baptizing in Eanon, near to Salem, *because there was much water there.*" Now, if baptism was performed by sprinkling a few drops of water upon those baptized, why put the people to the trouble of going to rivers and places of much water? Why do we find John, the Baptizer, lingering about the Jordan? Aye! and baptizing them *in* the Jordan? The only rational answer is, his baptism was an immersion.

I have been astonished to hear some preachers of the Methodist Episcopal church try to make it appear that John did not baptize *in* the river, but only *at* the river, when their book of Discipline, in the baptismal service, requires the minister to pray, saying: "By the baptism of thy well beloved son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify water for this holy sacrament." Thus it would seem,

according to this creed, that Christ was not only baptized *in* Jordan, but that, by placing his sacred person in the waters of that river, all the waters on the face of the broad earth were sanctified, and set apart to the use of baptizing. Still these preachers fly in the face of their own creed, and say that John did not baptize in Jordan! To make this appear, these preachers quote John i, 28: "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." But by a careful analysis of this scripture it will be seen that John did not baptize beyond Jordan, but that Bethabara was beyond Jordan. This will appear plain by the following questions and answers:

Q. What things were these?

A. Levites and priests asked John many questions concerning his character and mission.

Q. Where were these things done?

A. In Bethabara.

Q. Where was Bethabara?

A. Beyond Jordan.

Q. At what point on Jordan?

A. The place where John was baptizing.

Bethabara is generally believed to have been a house on the further bank of Jordan, opposite Jerusalem, at the place where the Israelites crossed when they took possession of Canaan.

In answer to the second scripture quoted under this item, it is said that John held a very large meeting at Eanon, on this occasion, and that he sought a place of *much water*, for the accommodation of the people and their beasts during the protracted meeting!

But it is not said that John *preached* at Eanon because there was much water there; but he *baptized* in Eanon because there was much water there. The *much water* is not named as the reason for their *being there*, but as the reason

for baptizing there. Then baptism required *much water*, and therefore must have been immersion.

2. Persons, when baptized, are said to go down into the water, and come up out of the water. See Matt. iii, 16; Acts viii, 38. These circumstances are all in favor of immersion. Why go down into the water to be sprinkled? I once heard a preacher say, that he had taken persons down into the water, and there baptized them by affusion. But, I ask, why did he go into the water? Because the subject would not be satisfied without it. But why was this so? Because they read in the Holy Scriptures: "*They went down* both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." Had these persons never read in the good book of persons being baptized in the river, and of their going into the water to be baptized, they never would have desired to go into the water. And had not their judgments been misled by their teachers, they would not only have gone into the water, but they would have been immersed in the water.

3. Baptism is called a planting. "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. vi, 5. Now, when we plant a grain of corn, we always cover it up. On this verse, Dr. McKnight makes the following remark: "The burying of Christ and of believers, first in the water of baptism, and afterwards in the earth, is, fitly enough, compared to the planting of seeds in the earth, because the effect in both cases is a reviviscence to a state of greater perfection." How this good and great man could have practiced sprinkling after penning this sentence, I can not tell, unless he acknowledged the right of the church to change the ordinance.

4. Persons baptized are said to be buried. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism." Rom. vi, 4. "Buried

with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Col. ii, 12.

Now, I ask, in what sense can sprinkling or pouring water upon a person be called a burial? This should settle the question forever. Still, men will cavil. Hence, it has been said that the burying referred to in Col. ii, 12, can not mean water baptism, because they are said to be raised by faith, whereas, in baptism, they are raised by the hands of the administrator. But if the reader will look again, he will see that Paul does not say they were *risen by faith*, but they were risen *with him*, through faith. Faith qualifies the rising. A person might be buried in the water a thousand times, and raised up as often, and, without faith, he would not be buried with Christ, nor raised with him. Faith brings Christ and the believer in near alliance; so that when he is baptized, having evangelical faith in Christ, he is said to be buried *with* him, and raised up *with* him. But it has also been asserted that these scriptures refer to spiritual baptism. What a strange creature man is! When endeavoring to prove baptism by sprinkling or pouring, they say, spiritual baptism is always performed by affusion, and water baptism should be performed in the same way. Then, when we read in the scriptures that persons are *buried* by baptism, they turn round and gravely assert that this is spiritual baptism! Truly, the legs of the lame are not equal. Then, according to their own showing, water baptism ought to be a burial also. If not, the whole argument drawn from spritual baptism is gone.

But, that these scriptures refer to water baptism has been admitted by Archbishop Tillotson, Archbishop Secker, Samuel Clark, Dodridge, George Whitfield, McKnight, John Wesley, and a host of others, who were all affusionists.

5. In baptism, persons are said to have their bodies washed. "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb. x, 22. McKnight paraphrases this, thus: "*Being washed in body*, with the clean water of baptism." And he further says: "*Λελουμανοι.* This word is commonly applied to the washing of the whole body." But this could never be said of a person who has been baptized by affusion.

6. The Greek church has always immersed. This fact speaks volumes in favor of immersion; for though they do not speak the ancient Greek language, yet their language comes nearer to it than any other now in use—and hence, they must understand that language better than any other people. When we find them, therefore, ever since the separation between the Greek and Latin churches, still practicing immersion, and refusing, under any circumstance, to sprinkle, it should certainly be considered as affording no small amount of testimony in favor of the idea that immersion was the apostolic mode.

7. The Roman Catholics admit that the apostolic mode was immersion. But they claim the right to change ordinances to suit the circumstances of the church.

8. That immersion was the ancient mode has been admitted by many who practiced affusion. Let the following suffice:

MOSHEIM.—"The sacrament of baptism was administered in this [first] century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." In the second century, he says: "The sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice every year, at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost or Whitsuntide, either by the bishop, or in consequence of his authority

and appointment, by the presbyters. The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

GROTIUS.—"That baptism used to be performed by immersion, and not by pouring, appears both from the proper signification of the word, and the places chosen for the administration of the rite, (John iii, 23; Acts viii, 38), and also from the many allusions of the apostles, which can not be referred to sprinkling, (Rom. vi, 3, 4; Col. ii, 12)." Grotius died A. D. 1645.

BOSSUET.—"The baptism of John, which served for a preparation to that of Jesus Christ, was performed by plunging. ✲ ✲ ✲ In fine, we read not in the scriptures that baptism was otherwise administered; and we are able to make it appear, by the acts of councils, and by the ancient rituals, that for THIRTEEN *hundred years*, baptism was thus administered *throughout the whole church* as far as was possible." [In Mr. Stennett against Russell, pp. 175-76.] Bossuet died A. D. 1704.

John Wesley, on Rom. vi, 4, says: "Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

9. My ninth argument in favor of immersion is, the meaning of the word employed by Christ and his apostles to express the ordinance. Indeed, this of itself seems to us to be sufficient to fix the action intended to be performed. For the word expresses an action, and not a mere ordinance, which may be performed in different modes. Hence, wherever I have spoken of the *mode* of baptism, or of baptism *by affusion*, or *immersion*, I have done it in accommodation to modern custom. As before stated, there is nothing

like it in all the New Testament. We never read in apostolic writings of the *mode* of baptism. They always speak of this ordinance as a specific action.

Baptizo, the word always employed to express this rite, was not originally the name of an ordinance. The Saviour did not first introduce this word. He found it in common use among the people. Hence, when he ordained this ordinance, he did not use this word because it was the name of a religious ceremony, but because it expressed the very act which he intended to be performed when persons were baptized. This fact seems to have been overlooked, and hence *baptizo* is regarded merely as the name of an ordinance which may be performed in many ways.

Greenfield, Donnegan, and Liddell and Scott, in their Greek lexicons, all give dip, immerse, or submerge, as the first meaning of *baptizo*. Hence, Luther said: "Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated *immersion*, as when we immerse something in the water that it may be wholly covered. * * * Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized to be altogether dipt into the water, as the word doth sound, and the mystery doth signify." [I quote from Hinton's History of Baptism.]

G. Campbell, of Scotland, in his note on Mark vii, 3, 4, says: "For illustrating this passage, let it be observed, first, that the two verbs rendered *wash*, in the English translation, are different in the original. The first is *νιψωνται*, properly translated *wash*; the second is *βαπτισωνται*, which limits us to a particular mode of washing; for *βαπτιζω* denotes 'to plunge,' 'to dip.'" Hence, he translates *baptizo*, *dipping*, in the text. And, as already stated, Dr. McKnight translates this word *immersion*, in Heb ix, 10. Why these Presbyterian doctors translated this word

immerse, when applied to other things, and rendered it *baptism* when this ordinance is referred to, I leave others to decide.

George Campbell translates this word *βαπτιζω*, *immersion*, in Matt. xx, 22, and makes this remark upon it: "The primitive signification of *βαπτισμα*, is *immersion;* of *βαπτιζειν*, to *immerse*, *plunge*, or *overwhelm*. The noun ought never to be rendered *baptism*, nor the verb *to baptize*, but when employed in relation to a religious ceremony."

Here, reader, we will leave the action of baptism for your careful consideration, hoping you will weigh well what we have said.

III. According to the order proposed, I will now say a few things in reference to the design of baptism. This is a very important item. If I am to be baptized, I should know the object. Indeed, all the importance that attaches to the ordinance at all, is derived from its design.

1. Baptism may be regarded as a profession of faith in Christ. First, we believe with the heart that Christ is the Son of God; that he died for our sins; that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day. Then, when we are baptized, we show our faith in these facts, by a death to sin, a burial in baptism, and a rising to walk in newness of life.

2. By baptism we come out from the world; we cross the line that separates between them that serve God and them that serve him not.

3. By baptism we enter into covenant with God, and take our stand with his people; so that we "are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."

4. By baptism we come into Christ, into his mystical body, and thus take his yoke, or government, upon us. Hence the apostle says, "Know ye not that so many of us

as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death?" Rom. vi, 3. And again: "Ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized *into Christ*, have put on Christ." Gal. iii, 26, 27.

5. But I will go one step further, and say, that baptism stands in the gospel as INSTITUTION OF PARDON.

I do not mean by this, that baptism pardons sin. Nor do I mean that baptism merits pardon. But I mean that God has appointed baptism as an ordinance in which we publicly give up ourselves wholly to the Lord, and in doing which he, of his own free grace and mercy, forgives our past transgressions. Hence, baptism may justly be regarded as one of the gospel terms of remission.

There were many institutions of pardon under the old covenant. The sin-offering was an ordinance of this kind. In certain cases the law said, concerning the man who had sinned: "He shall confess that he hath sinned in that *thing*, and shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord, for his sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin. He shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin-offering upon the side of the altar, and the rest of the blood shall be rung out at the bottom of the altar; it is a sin-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for his sin which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him." Lev. v, 6–10. Thus it is clear that this was, not an institution that pardoned, but an institution of pardon. When a person sinned, and complied with this ordinance, the law declared him pardoned; but if he refused to obey the Lord in this institution, his sin remained upon him—he could not be pardoned according to the law in the case.

The yearly national atonement was an institution of the same sort; and so, also, was the law concerning the scape-

goat. In obedience to these, the nation obtained a legal remission; but when they neglected them, the disapprobation of heaven rested upon them. Such, reader, is the ordinance of baptism. These old institutions, however, pertained to the flesh, but baptism to the conscience. Hence, Peter says of baptism, that it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." 1 Pet. iii, 21.

But when we say baptism is "FOR THE REMISSION OF SIN," some of our religious neighbors become awfully alarmed, and begin to tell frightful tales about sick and dying persons who can not be baptized, and therefore must go to hell. Then they imagine cases of persons in some sandy desert, where there is no water; here they die of hunger and thirst. They may here repent and pray, but all in vain—baptism is impossible, and therefore they must sink to everlasting torment. But in all this, they forget that He who gave the law is above all law, and can do as he pleases with his own. But if we intimate that God may, perhaps, extend his mercy beyond the terms prescribed in the gospel, and save a person so situated, then they turn round with an air of triumph, and say, if one sinner can be pardoned without baptism, then all sinners may be! Mighty logic, this! If God would save a man without baptism, where the only reason for his not being baptized is a physical impossibility—he being perfectly willing and anxious to do the will of God as far as is in his power, therefore he will pardon and save a man who knows the law of God, and all things are ready and convenient for him to obey, but he willingly, and willfully, of his own choice, refuses to be baptized!

Remember, reader, I have not proposed to show what God will not do, in all the various cases that might be imagined. This is not the proposition before us. "Secret

things belong unto God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us, and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." Deut. xxix, 29. My object is not to show what may be obtained and enjoyed in any case without baptism; but to show what baptism is for. I have said it is an institution of pardon, and I now proceed to give the proof:

1. My first proof is drawn from John's baptism. I know that this was not the Christian baptism—or, if you please, was not performed under the Christian dispensation—still, as John's was a preparatory work, the design of his baptism may throw some light upon this. Concerning John and his mission, we have the following declarations: "And he shall go before him (the Lord) in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." "And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways—to give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins." Luke i, 16—76, 77.

From these scriptures, it is seen that John was—

1. To prepare the way of the Lord.

2. To prepare a people for the Lord.

3. To give the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins.

How, then, did he do these things? I answer, by preaching and baptizing. John may be regarded as sent out into the wilderness to prepare materials for the Lord's house. But no person could be placed in this spiritual temple whose sins were not forgiven. Therefore, some materials had to be prepared beforehand, with which to commence the building—to organize with. This, then, was John's work, and as remission was to be one of the

special blessings under the new covenant, when it went into operation, those whom John prepared for the Lord, should obtain remission in the same institution, so far as the action of it is concerned, in which persons were to obtain remission during the whole lifetime of that covenant. Thus it was that while John prepared a people for the Lord, he prepared the Lord's way at the same time.

But how could John give the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins? Answer: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," Mark i, 4. Hence he baptized the people for the remission of sin. Understanding this, and believing that John was sent from God to do this very work, for this very purpose, when they obeyed the Lord in this ordinance, they had all the knowledge that the word of God could give; that their sins were forgiven. That John was sent of God to baptize, and that the Lord required the people to be baptized, is clear; for, "all the people that heard him, and the publicans justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him," Luke vii, 29, 30. But they could not reject the counsel of God by not being baptized of John, unless God had enjoined this baptism; nor could they have justified God in being baptized, but on the same principle. Dr. George Campbell renders it thus: "by receiving baptism from him, (John), they honored God."

2. *The apostles' commission.* This is my second argument in favor of my proposition. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark xvi, 15, 16. This is the most sublime and glorious commission that ever was committed into the hands of men. It extends, in its offered blessing,

to all nations, in all lands, and in all time. It is short, but comprehensive. It is composed of few words, but it contains blessings as boundless as our sins, and as enduring as the throne of God. But the promise contained in this commission, is the evidence we now adduce in favor of the doctrine of baptism for remission.

"*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*" The salvation here promised can not refer to the final salvation in heaven. For even those who have thus believed and been baptized, are commanded to "work out their salvation with fear and trembling," Phil. ii, 12. There is a present salvation often spoken of in the New Testament. Paul to Timothy, speaking of God, says: "Who hath saved us and called us, not according to our works," etc. Here persons are said to be already saved. The same idea is expressed in Titus iii, 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us." Notice, these persons are now saved. John Wesley's translation of Acts ii, 47, conveys the same idea. "And the Lord added daily to the church, those who were saved." This salvation is the same which is spoken of by the angel, "thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." Matt. i, 21.

All who are living in their sins, unforgiven, are under condemnation; the wrath or disapprobation of God rests upon them. But when they are pardoned, they are released from that guilt; they are saved from that state of condemnation; they are made free from sin, and are therefore always spoken of as saved. Now it must be to this Christ refers in his commission to his apostles. Go into all the world; proclaim the glad tidings of salvation through my blood to every creature; and as you preach, tell all the world, that whosoever receives your teaching concerning me, with all their heart, and will be baptized, shall be saved;

shall be forgiven of all their past offenses against God's moral government. More than this no one should desire to make of this promise; and less than this, no one should dare attempt.

Thus it is seen that our proposition is sustained by the very commission under which all the preaching and baptizing done by the apostles and first evangelists was performed.

3. As a third item of evidence in favor of the position that baptism is an institution of pardon, I refer to the text upon which this discourse is based: "*Repent* and be *baptized in the name of Jesus Christ every one of you, for the remission of sins.*"

Here is the very proposition for which I am contending, uttered by an inspired apostle, at the very commencement of the Gospel kingdom. Who would ask for more testimony than this? Consider the circumstances under which this announcement was made. The disciples had been waiting with most intense anxiety, for about ten days, for the promised Spirit. They had been commissioned to preach the Gospel to all the nations of earth; but forbidden to say one word upon the theme of salvation through the Lord's death until they should receive power from on high. Much depended upon a correct commencement. A blunder here might ruin the cause, and drown many souls in perdition. Therefore the importance of being well prepared for the opening of the reign of Christ on earth. O what a solemn ten days this must have been.

But while they are thus waiting, all of a sudden they hear a sound as of a rushing mighty wind; it came rumbling through the heavens until it came to the place where they were collected, and gathered itself into the house; cloven tongues resembling fire, sit upon each of them, and they are all filled with the Holy Spirit, and begin to speak. Now the ten days' silence is broken; now the prohibition is taken

off; now they may tell all that Jesus has told them in secret; they may tell who he is, and what he has done to save our fallen world. They have received the Spirit to guide them into all truth; to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever the Saviour had told them, and to take the things of Christ and show them to these inspired witnesses of the Lord. They now understand all that is meant by that commission which we have just been considering. Yes, and if the position which I have taken is incorrect, they will set it all right now; but if I have taken the correct view of the promise contained in that commission, their teaching under its divine sanctions, will confirm that view.

Well, they commence speaking in all the languages then present; they first explain the miracle then transpiring before their eyes; next, they preach Christ and him crucified, referring the people to the fact, that they, with wicked hands, had crucified the Lord of glory. But they proceed to announce his resurrection, and prove it by the testimony of their beloved David, and by what they then saw and heard. They close this part of the address by saying "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made this same Jesus whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ." "Now, when they heard this they were pierced in their heart, and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, *Men and brethren what shall we do?* Acts ii, 36, 37.

Truly this was a solemn occcasion, and this a momentous question. It comes from the heart; yes, from hearts deeply penitent; from hearts pierced with the truth, burdened with guilt, and overwhelmed with sorrow for past sins. What shall we do? O, whither shall we fly? Is there no relief? And if there is, what must we do to obtain that relief? This seems to be the meaning of their inquiry.

The inspired Peter speaks; or rather, the Holy Spirit

speaks by him, saying, "repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*, and you shall receive the "gift of the Holy Spirit." O, is this so? may we be pardoned in this way. Yes, the promise made to Abraham, saying, in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed, "is to you and your descendants, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day were added to them about three thousand souls." There was no halting and caviling on this occasion; no long inquiries into the whys and wherefors. The case required prompt action; and they were honest; they were in good earnest, and hence they obeyed, and thus obtained "the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sin."

Here then, we have a practical illustration of the doctrine of baptism for remission of sin. And yet after all, men will doubt, and hesitate, and even dispute this doctrine. To some of the explanations given to this text for the purpose of evading the doctrine that baptism is one of the gospel terms of pardon, I must pay a little attention in passing.

I. It is sometimes assumed that *for*—here means, *because of*, and hence, that these persons were commanded to be baptized because their sins were pardoned.

I answer, first, that they were not commanded to be baptized *alone* for the remission of sin; but to *repent and be baptized.* And repentance and baptism are united by a copulative conjunction, which shows that whatever they were to repent for, they were to be baptized for; and whatever they were to be baptized for, they were to repent for. If then, they were to be baptized because their sins were pardoned, they were to repent because their sins were pardoned! Who is prepared for this conclusion? No one, I

am sure. All say they were to repent in order to the remission of sins. Then, dear reader, they were to be baptized for the same purpose.

2. But I answer secondly, that we have the same form of expression in other scriptures, where no doubt is left as to the meaning. Jesus said, "This is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for many *for the remission of sins.*

Now does not, *for the remission of sins*, in this passage, mean *in order to?* To this everybody says yes! No dispute about it. Well, the phraseology is the same in our text; why then is not the meaning the same? I know of but one reason, and that is, baptism is in the sentence. Just take baptism out, and read it, repent for the remission of sins, and there would be but one view on the subject; all would say, *for* means *in order to,* and this passage would be quoted by all classes of preachers to prove the importance of repentance in order to pardon.

II. But a second class of objectors say, it is true that Peter taught the doctrine of baptism for, or in order to remission on the day of Pentecost, but that was intended for the Jews; whereas the Gentiles were to be pardoned without baptism. And to sustain this view, it is said that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit before he was baptized, and the fact that he had received the spirit was made the reason why he should be baptized. See Acts x. 44, 47.

1. I answer first, that we have seen under the former head of this discourse, that the gift of the Holy Spirit received by those in the house of Cornelius was an extraordinary gift, such as enabled them to speak in languages which they never understood before. This miraculous gift was designed to convince Peter, and those Jewish brethren who came with him, and all others, that the gospel was to be preached to the Gentiles, and that they should be received into the church on equal terms with the Jews. Hence,

Peter said, "can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we." And hence, when he was charged with doing wrong in this case, he said, "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us that believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God." Acts xi, 17. If those who oppose us never baptize any until they receive the Holy Spirit as these did, they will not baptize any one soon.

2. I reply secondly, that "God put no difference between us and them," (the Jews and Gentiles) "purifying their hearts by faith." Acts xv, 9.

3. My third reply is, that the whole gospel scheme was designed to make of Jews and Gentiles "one new man, so making peace." Now, if, at the very beginning, the Lord had given two laws of pardon, one for Jews and the other for Gentiles, he would have laid the foundation for everlasting contention and strife between them! This, the God of all wisdom and grace never would have done.

III. But a third class of objectors say that the preposition *for* is translated from the Greek preposition *eis*, which does not mean *in order to*, but *into*.

To this I reply, that this does not alter the sense. For to be baptized *into* the remission of sins, is certainly to be baptized into a pardoned state.

Thus, all the objections raised against the plain, unsophisticated doctrine of baptism for remission of sins, are removed, and the doctrine stands firm as the throne of God.

How beautifully the language of Ananias to Saul accords with this view. "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xxii, 16. Not that baptism would wash away his sins, but, that when he complied with Gods' law of remission, the Lord would pardon his sins. Hence, Paul

said, "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus iii, 5. In the same sense, Peter says, "Baptism now saves us." 1 Pet. iii, 21.

I might now go on to confirm this view by many of the most pious, learned, and orthodox commentators that have ever lived, but I am making this sermon too long, in spite of all my efforts at abridgement. And more is not necessary, for, if any will not be convinced with what we have now said, they would not be, though one should rise from the dead. May God help us all to love and do the truth as it is in Jesus.

SERMON XI.

WHAT SHALL I DO?

And when he had gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?

MARK X, 17.

I HAVE selected the above text, not for the purpose of writing a sermon on the character of the Lord, who was called Master, and declared to be good, by this young man, nor to discourse upon the whole verse, but for the purpose of bringing before the reader's mind the simple question, "*What shall I do?*" as the theme of this discourse.

This is a very important question, even when applied to the common affairs of this life, but much more so when it is asked in reference to life eternal. God requires service of his creature man; how important is it, then, that we perform that service! A question, then, having reference to the service which the Lord requires, to the will of God in reference to our manner of life, must be interesting. It should often be asked, What shall I do? We should make this question a subject of anxious thought every day, What shall I do for the Lord and his holy cause, this day? The man who never asked this question, nor reflects upon it, is not likely to be very efficient in the service of his God or his country. To do good service, we must know the will of God; and to know this, we must often ask, and answer,

in the light of the Holy Scriptures, the question upon which we base this discourse.

We have many examples of persons asking this question, recorded in the New Testament. One is found in the scripture which we have placed at the head of this discourse. This young man seemed to be in good earnest; he came in great haste, even running, and he kneeled before the Saviour, and, as if his whole soul was in the matter, he exclaimed, "*Good Master, what shall I do?*"

On another occasion, we read of a great multitude, crying out, "*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" Acts ii, 37. The Philippian jailer affords another example. He said, "*Sirs, what must I do to be saved?*" Acts xvi, 30. When Saul was convinced that Jesus was the Christ, he said, "*Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?*" Acts ix, 6. Or, as it is in Acts xxii, 10, "*What shall I do, Lord?*"

2. The interest which persons feel in the subject of salvation may generally be learned from the manner in which they treat the answer given to this question. In the example of the young man named in our text, there was not sufficient interest felt. No doubt he was sincere when he propounded this question to the Saviour. He desired to enjoy eternal life, and was anxious to know what was necessary for him to do in order to obtain that great blessing. But when Jesus said, "Sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, take up thy cross, and follow me," he seemed to think this was asking too much, and hence, "he was sad, and went away grieved." Ver. 21, 22. He had much feeling on the subject, and hence he was very sorrowful; but still, he was not sorry enough—or, he did not "sorrow after a godly manner."

How many do we find in our day who seem honest, and anxious to be saved—who, when they are directed to

renounce the follies of the world, and take up the cross and follow Christ, in obedience to the gospel, draw back? They go away sorrowful—but still they will not obey. They seem to say that the Lord has required too much. This shows that they do not feel the amount of interest in the subject that they should. If they did, they would be willing to give up all for Christ—they would be disposed to make any sacrifice that the Lord demands, in order to obtain eternal life.

In the case of the three thousand, there was no hesitating—no going away sorrowful. They felt just right on the subject—hence, they received the answer to the question, WHAT SHALL WE DO? with great joy, and they complied the same day. So in the case of Saul. He felt deep interest in the subject, and therefore, when the Lord told him what to do, he did it at once. He says, "I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision." The same is true in reference to the jailer and his family. They obeyed the gospel the same hour of the night in which they believed. This shows that they did not say, *What must we do?* out of vain curiosity—they were awfully alarmed for their condition, and they desired salvation above all things. Hence, the promptness with which they complied with the directions given.

3. This question implies great mental agony, where it is sincerely propounded, with a determination to comply with the divine directions when given. Who can describe the feelings of the three thousand when they asked this solemn question! "They were *pierced* in their hearts." They felt great mental anguish. So it was with Saul. What must have been the feelings of that man, when the Lord said unto him, "*I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest?*" Well might he respond, "LORD, WHAT SHALL I DO?"

4. This question implies great extremity. It implies that the person asking it has tried all the means known to him for the accomplishment of the proposed end, in vain; that all has failed, and what more to do, he knows not. All his schemes have disappointed him, and hence, losing all confidence in every earthly reliance, he exclaims, *O, what shall I do?*

5. This question is always regarded as a favorable symptom. It shows that there is a good degree of anxiety on the subject of religion. Hence, the prayer that we so often hear—that the cry may be extorted, Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved? I have often wondered, if this prayer should be answered, and the cry was made, whether those who make the prayer would give a Bible answer. I fear, in many cases, they would not.

6. The next suggestion that I will make in reference to this interrogation is, that it should always be answered according to the design of the person asking it, and the character and condition of the person who propounds the question. If a sick man asks what he must do to be cured, he should be answered in regard to the nature of his disease, and the remedies necessary for his recovery. If I ask the way to Philadelphia, I should not be answered with directions teaching me how I must act when I get there. Now, when the three thousand asked of the apostle, what they should do, they desired to know what law they must comply with—what duty they must perform—in order to obtain the remission of sins. Then all that is contained in the apostle's answer was to be done in order to that end. Reader, pause, and think of this carefully—then read the answer.

Some doctors of divinity seem to think that they have discovered a universal remedy for all cases—a general specific that will apply in every stage of the disease—

hence they give the same direction to every patient that applies. Faith, and *faith alone*, is the sovereign remedy that is to meet every case. It matters not what the state of mind may be, or what progress the applicant may have made, he is only told the one duty. No inquiries are made into the state of the case; the same remedy is always prescribed!

Reader, what would you say of a physician who would pursue such a course? I am sure you would doubt his skill in the healing art. And should we not be equally careful in reference to spiritual life? The body is very important, but the soul is of much more value, insomuch that Jesus intimates that if a man should gain the whole world, and lose his soul in the transaction, he is infinitely the loser.

Now I will apply the principle that every man, when he asks the question, *what shall I do?* in reference to gospel salvation, should be answered according to his design and condition, to all the cases we can possibly imagine, and will show the proper answer to be given in every case, by examples in the New Testament.

1. Suppose a person who is entirely ignorant of Christ and his religion; he has never heard the Gospel, and therefore knows nothing in reference to the gospel plan of saving sinners. He has just obtained light enough to know that he is a sinner, exposed to everlasting ruin; and therefore he is awfully alarmed, and cries out in the bitterness of his soul, *what shall I do?* what must I do to be saved?

The religious teacher should then find a similar case in the days of the apostles, and answer him just as the apostles did in such a case. This would be right, for Christianity is the same now that it was then; the mind of God is the same now that it was in the days of the apostles; human nature is the same, sin is the same, and the law of remission is the

same, for we live in the same dispensation in which these apostles preached and taught. Hence the same instructions given to persons at that time, by those who spoke as the Spirit directed, would be applicable now to persons in the same state of mind and morals.

We have just such a case as I have supposed, in the example of the Philippian jailer. He was a Gentile, untaught in the religion of either Old or New Testament. Of course, he knew nothing of Christ. I presume he had never before heard his name. Or if he had, he had only heard of him as one who had been crucified for blasphemy and treason.

But, he has committed to his care, for safe keeping, two men, said to be teachers of the way of salvation, but who are charged with teaching customs not lawful for the people to observe. These men are confined in the dark, damp dungeon, and their feet secured in the stocks. At mid-night they are heard singing, which always indicates a cheerful mind. An awful earthquake succeeds, the prison doors are miraculously opened, and every man's bands are loosed. Now, all this was well calculated to alarm the keeper of the prison. But when he saw that the prison doors were all open, supposing that the prisoners had all fled as a matter of course, he thought of the penalty of the law to which he was exposed; and, thinking it more honorable to kill himself, than to be put to death for neglect of official duty, he drew his sword and was about to take his own life. But Paul cried out with a loud voice, expressive of great concern for the welfare of the jailer, "*do thyself no harm, we are all here.*"

This was well calculated to give him great confidence in Paul and Silas, and in the God they served; therefore he brought them out of the prison into his own house, and said, "*sirs, what must I do to be saved?*" "And they said

believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." That is, if you and your family believe, you may all be saved.

This is the answer to which I referred when I said, some people give the same answer to the question under consideration, in all cases. Still, if they would carry out this whole example, it would not be so bad. I have heard some preachers quote this, "*only believe on the Lord;*" but it does not read so in the book.

The reader will notice that the apostle did not leave this man at this point. He remembered the question, which he propounded to others: "how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard?" And his response was still in his mind: "*so then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*" Therefore, "they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." Now, in speaking the word of the Lord, they doubtless told these persons that Jesus had said, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" for this is a part of the word of the Lord. But this is more than mere conjecture, for "he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized; he and all his, straightway," Acts xvi, 25—32. Thus the answer and obedience closed with baptism.

2. But suppose a person who does most sincerely believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God; that he died for our sins, was buried, and rose again according to the Scriptures. This person is conscious that he is a sinner, exposed to condemnation, and in deep anguish of soul he asks, What must I do to be saved? *O, what shall I do?* Shall I answer him just as Paul did the jailer? Surely not. I have a very different case before me, and hence, I must suit the directions to the case. Now, as an example to instruct me in this case, I would go to the three thousand, on the day of Pentecost.

Here are persons just as anxious to be saved, as was the jailor. And their salvation is just as precious in the sight of God; and yet the apostle does not tell them to believe. He does not say to them, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved." He says, in answer to this solemn question, "*Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" Acts ii, 38.

Now, the only reason that can be given for this difference in the answer of Paul and Peter, is that they were addressing persons in a different state of mind. Paul was teaching a man who had no faith, and hence he told him to believe; but Peter is addressing persons who do believe, and hence he commences with them at reformation. I conclude that they believed what Peter taught, or they would not have been so affected. It was when Peter said, "therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this same Jesus whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ," that they were pierced in their hearts. But had they not believed this proposition, it would not have produced this effect. But this example, like that of the jailer, was consummated in baptism.

3. But let us suppose a different case from either of these. Suppose a person who believes in Christ, and has a good moral character, and is very devout and piously inclined, should ask the question, What must I do to be saved? *What shall I do?* It would not do to tell him to believe, for he does believe; and it would not do to tell him to reform his life, for this is acceptable. Now, can we find any example in the New Testament, that will suit a case of this sort?

If the reader will turn to the tenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, he will find one that just illustrates the

case I have supposed. Here we have an account of Cornelius, of whom it is said, "he was a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house; who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always." Truly this was a very good man. He seems to have been a proselyte to the Jews' religion, and hence his worship and prayers were all performed according to the "law of commandments concerning ordinances," after that law had expired; after Jesus "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." Therefore, he is not regarded as in a saved state, according to the new covenant. Hence, the angel that appeared unto him, said, "Send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter; * * he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." Cornelius understood this to have reference to his salvation. He understood that when Peter came, he would give him the correct answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" For when Peter was come, he said to him, "Now, therefore, we are all present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." And Peter so understood it, for when he returned to Jerusalem, and the brethren complained of him for going among the Gentiles, he related the whole matter; in doing which, he said that Cornelius told him, on his arrival at his house, that "he had seen an angel, which stood and said unto him, Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter, who shall tell thee words whereby *thou and all thy house shall be saved.*" Acts xi, 10, 11.

Now, Peter did not state the words of the angel, as they stand in Acts x, 6. There it reads, "He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do;" but Peter quotes it, "He shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." Now this is all explained by saying, that Peter understood the angel as meaning, "he shall tell thee what

thou must do in order to be saved." So, then, this good man was not a saved man, according to the gospel.

But now we ask, what did Peter tell him to do, when he came? What duty did he impose on him? Does he give him the answer that Paul gave the Philippian jailer? No, he does not say, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." He saw that Cornelius did believe. He did not say, "Repent and be baptized," as he did on the day of Pentecost, for he had learned all about this man's good character, and therefore knew that reformation in his case was not necessary. Hence, "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts x, 48.

Here, then, are three cases, in which the answer to the question *What shall I do?* seems to differ. Not that one is told to do some things which others are forbidden to do; but that more is required of some than others. This can only be accounted for on the principle that some had done more than others, before the answer is given.

Suppose three persons are invited to partake of the bounties of a friend's table: one is three steps from the table, another is two steps, and the third is only one step from the board. When about to take their places at the table, the one that was only two steps from the refreshment, would only have to take these two steps; he would not have to go back and take the first step. But the one that was farthest off, would have to take all the steps necessary to bring him to the table. And the one that was only one step off, would not be compelled to go back and take the first and second steps; these he has taken before the invitation reaches him. Still, there is one step that must be taken in each case; the last, or third step, must be taken by all who would partake of the rich provisions of this friend's board.

So in the examples just referred to. Let these three steps in the figure represent faith, repentance, and baptism. The jailer had to take all these steps, in order to be saved according to the gospel; hence, in answering the question "*What shall I do?*" the apostle commenced with the first step—but he never left him until he had taken the other two, closing the work with baptism, the last step. The Pentecostians, having taken the first step, are only commanded to take the remaining two, closing with baptism. But Cornelius had taken the first two steps; he believed, and had so reformed his life that he "was devout, gave much alms, and prayed to God always." Hence, he is only commanded to take the last step, closing with baptism.

Thus are all these examples harmonized, and thus they afford much instruction to all who desire to be saved; and to all who are engaged in teaching men the way of life and salvation. When the soul-stirring question is propounded, "*What shall I do to be saved?*" we should always inquire into the real condition of the person making the inquiry—learn their moral *stand-point*—and then answer them according to the examples which we have just examined.

4. But I now think of a case different from any that I have considered. Suppose a person who has once belonged to the church of God—he has taken all the steps illustrated in the foregoing examples, but he has *back-slid*—he has fallen into sin—but he now sees "from whence he has fallen," and desiring to obtain the remission of his sins, and to be restored to the fellowship of the Father and his Son Jesus Christ, he asks the question, "*What must I do?*" Can we find an example in the New Testament, that will throw any light on this case—that will suggest the proper answer to be given?

Yes, reader, we have one that just suits the case. It will be found in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. In this chapter we have an account of the preaching of the gospel to the Samaritans: "Then Philip went down to a city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them. And the people, with one accord, gave heed to those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. * * But there was a certain man called Simon, who beforetime, in the same city, used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one; to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is the great power of God. But when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles which he did." Acts viii, 5-13.

But time rolls on. The apostles at Jerusalem heard that the Samaritans had received the truth, and become obedient to the same; and that this new church might possess miraculous powers, they sent two of their number, Peter and John, to this city, for the purpose of imparting those gifts. This they did by prayer, and the laying on of hands. And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands, the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hand, he may receive the Holy Ghost. "But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God."

Now, here is just such a case as we have supposed. This man had believed, and been baptized; in a word, he had

taken all the steps that others had done in order to the remission of sins, and he was numbered with the members of this new church. I know that some have thought, from the conduct of this man, that he had never been pardoned. But we are bound to come to one of three conclusions: either that the witness has not told the truth; or that the promise of the Lord failed; or that Simon was a saved, a pardoned man. The inspired witness says, "Then Simon himself believed also, and when he was baptized he continued with Philip," etc. He does not say that Simon professed to believe; or that he hypocritically imposed on Philip; but, that *he himself believed;* and not only believed, but *believed also;* that is, believed just as the other Samaritans believed. And he was also baptized. Now, Jesus said, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Now, I ask, did the witness state the truth? You are bound to say he did. Then, did the promise of the Lord fail? You dare not say it did. Then Simon was pardoned, was saved from his past sins. When persons have been addicted to some favorite sin before they embrace Christianity, if they are ever led away from the good cause, it is likely to be by that old darling sin.

Now this man had bewitched the people by his sorceries in former days, and in that way no doubt made money. When he saw the apostles imparting miraculous powers by the laying on of hands, he thought a wicked thought. He seems to have reasoned thus: Now, if I had such power, I could make a fortune. Who would not pay me a good price, to be enabled to speak in many languages without studying? or to possess the power to heal a sick man with a touch, or a word? Now, I will give a good sum of money for the power to give such gifts, by the laying on of my hands. Hence, he "offered them money, saying, Give me

also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost." But Peter told him, that because he had done this—had entertained this mercenary thought, and proposed to purchase the gift of God with money, that he and his money should both perish; telling him, however, that so far as the impartation of these miraculous powers by the imposition of hands is concerned, he (Simon) had no part nor lot in the matter. As much as to say, this work belongs to the apostles alone. For, although Philip could do miracles himself, he could not impart that power to others; hence it was necessary for these apostles to come all the way from Jerusalem for this purpose.

But Peter's pointed address, and plain reasoning, convinced him that he had done wrong, and he became very anxious to regain the favor of God, and to obtain the remission of his sin. Here then is just such a case as we have supposed.

Now, what did the apostle tell this man to do? Remember, we have the same inspired Peter here, whose teachings we have heard on two other occasions; we have heard his answer to the question under consideration on the Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius. We have seen that he adapted his advice on these occasions to the condition of the persons addressed. But now he has a different case before him. Did he tell this man to believe? No, he did believe. Did he tell him to repent of all his former sins? No; this he had done. Did he command him to be baptized? No; this he had done once; and, according to the gospel, there is but one baptism. This man had become a constitutional citizen of the kingdom of Christ; and therefore, notwithstanding he had forfeited the privileges of this kingdom by sin, it was not necessary for him to take the oath of allegiance again. Let us then hear the direction of the apostle on the subject.

"REPENT THEREFORE OF THIS THY WICKEDNESS, AND PRAY TO GOD, IF PERHAPS THE THOUGHT OF THINE HEART MAY BE FORGIVEN THEE." Here then is the proper answer to be given to a citizen of the kingdom of Christ who has fallen into sin. This is the law of pardon for the disciples of Christ who have been formally inducted into the family of God. This case is a full answer to those who ask, if baptism is for remission of sin, must not Christians be baptized every time they are overtaken in a fault? To this instruction may be added the words of the apostle, "If we" (Christians) "confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 1 John i, 9.

5. I can think of but one case more that can possibly be found; one other character, who may propound the question, "*what shall I do to be saved?*" The pious Christian, "whose sins are forgiven, and whose iniquities are covered," may often ask this question, in reference to his duty. Cases often occur in which the best of men are at a loss to know what duty requires. This is only in cases of expediency, however. So far as the general life of the Christian is concerned, he is thoroughly furnished in the perfect law of liberty, with all necessary instruction. Still, cases often present themselves where duty is not so clear, and hence the question may be asked in such cases, "*what shall I do?*"

My answer, in all such cases, is, be honest before God; consider the case in all its bearings; submit all your ways to God, and do that which you honestly think will best secure the glory of God, the peace and harmony of the church, and promote the salvation of sinners. The man who lives a pious and prayerful life, studies the word of God much, and then pursues the above described course, will not be apt to miss the line of duty often. But if

he should not always do the very best that might have been done, he will have a good conscience, and can comfort himself with the reflection that it was an error of the head—not of the heart.

But, should the Christian ask this question in reference to his eternal salvation, "What shall I do to get to heaven at last?" Then the following answer would be applicable: "Work out your own salvation, with fear and trembling; for it is God who worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Phil. ii, 12, 13. "Be ye steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." 1 Cor. xv, 58. "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue (or courage), and to courage, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity." "For he that lacketh these things is blind, and can not see afar off, and has forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore, the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if you do these things you shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly, into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. i.

Indeed, the whole matter is embodied in few words, in the very conclusion of God's divine revelations to man: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. xxii, 14.

Thus, reader, I have endeavored to answer the question, "*What shall I do?*" when asked by persons in every condition that I can imagine; and in doing this, I have pointed out the road from every man's door, to the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Reader, what ground do you occupy? Examine yourself—acquaint yourself with your real condition before the Heavenly Father; let the question, "GOOD MASTER, WHAT SHALL I DO TO INHERIT ETERNAL LIFE?" sink deep into your heart; and take the advice given to persons occupying the same position to God's moral government which you occupy; and be faithful unto death, and Jesus says you shall have a crown of life

SERMON XII.

THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS.

Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation. HEB. i, 14.

ONE object the apostle had in presenting the facts which are mentioned in this connection, was to show the superiority of the gospel of Christ to the law of Moses. The Jews considered the law the most glorious institution in the world, and therefore they were unwilling to lay it aside and embrace the gospel. They had certain arguments by which they defended the honor and dignity of that law, in doing which they attempted to justify themselves in not receiving the gospel, and trusting in Christ for salvation. Among these arguments was the fact that, in the law, God had spoken by the most worthy and gifted men that ever lived, even by men endowed with prophetic wisdom.

The apostle does not deny this. Still he affirms that "God, who, at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past to the fathers, by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son," thus indicating that the character of him by whom God speaks in the gospel, is as far superior to those by whom he spake in the law, as the Son of the invisible Jehovah is superior to the sons of men, and that, therefore, the gospel is as much above the law as God's Son is above the prophets. But to exalt the giver

of the gospel in their minds to his proper dignity, he says of him: "Who, being the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

But the Jew would reply, God not only spake in the law by the prophets, but angels, or celestial messengers, were employed in giving that institution—that they "received the law by the disposition of angels." Acts vii, 53.

To this the apostle makes no objection, but declares that Christ is so much better than the angels, that "He hath, by inheritance, obtained a more excellent name than they," and that when God brought his first begotten into the world, he commanded all the angels to worship him. Verses 4-6. If then the law was glorious because it was given by a disposition of angels, or was handed down through ranks of angels properly disposed, how much more glorious must the gospel be, when these very angels are commanded to fall down and worship the Divine Personage by whom the gospel was given?

But, while the apostle is arguing the superiority of Christ to the most exalted angel that shines in superior excellency before the throne of God, he propounded the question contained in our text: "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?"

We are not to suppose, because Paul presents this matter in the form of a question, that he had any doubt as to the truth of the fact referred to—that angels minister to salvation's heirs. He often adopts the interrogative form when speaking of things about which there was no room for doubts. To the Corinthians he said: "Am I not an apostle? Am I not free? Have I not seen Jesus Christ, our

Lord? Are not ye my work in the Lord?" 1 Cor. ix, 1. Now, did Paul doubt his own apostleship? Or, did he doubt that he had seen the Lord Jesus? Surely not. He adopts the interrogative form in reference to the most indisputable facts, as the most forcible manner of expressing them.

Thus he propounds the question in reference to the ministry of angels, as a fact about which there was no doubt, or dispute—as if all who believed in the existence of angels at all, believed that these celestial beings minister to the heirs of salvation. He does not argue this point; he adduces no proof to sustain the proposition. He simply announces the truth, without debate, that "they are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them, who shall be heirs of salvation." As if he had said, This is a fact you all believe, and about which there is no controversy.

Without proposing any particular order to be observed in the further investigation of this subject, I will make a remark:

I. In reference to the nature of angels.

The term *angel* is an official and not a generic term; it is translated from *angelos*, which means, one sent—a messenger. Hence, it implies office, without defining the nature of the officer. Angels may be mortal or immortal—they may be celestial, terrestrial, or infernal—they may be sent by the Almighty, by men, or by the Prince of Darkness—they may be sent from heaven, from earth, or from hell.

But those mentioned in our text are all celestial in their nature and office. They are spiritual, immortal beings, and therefore are not operated on by physical laws. The laws which govern matter have no influence upon them, as we shall presently see. While contrasting the angels spoken of in this connection, with him by whom God speaks in the gospel, Paul says, God "maketh his angels spirits, and his

ministers a flame of fire." This is the highest appellation he has ever given to these heavenly messengers; they are *spirits*, and they have been seen in flaming fire. (See Ex., iii, 2).

We have but a poor idea of spirits; we do not understand our own spirits, much less beings that are spirit, and spirit only. We can not perceive them; they are not visible to human vision. True, angels have been seen by men in the flesh, but this was by miraculous, not natural power. I contend that in every case where these celestial messengers have been seen by mortal eyes, a miracle was performed.

Some have supposed, that because angels have been seen, therefore their bodies are composed of matter; very etherial and uncorruptible matter. They thus conclude, because they seem to think that spirits can not have a bodily form. Indeed, when they attempt to explain *spirit*, they make it as near *nothing* as you can possibly imagine. I see no good reason why spirits may not have a bodily shape, and still be *pure spirit*. Paul seems to teach this idea when he says, speaking of the resurrection of the body: "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body," 1 Cor. xv, 44. Such are the bodies of those celestial beings spoken of in our text; and hence they may be around and about us, and we perceive them not; they may mingle in our assemblies, but our eyes do not behold them. But when this mortal shall have put on immortality, I presume they will be visible to the glorified saints; then may saints and angels associate, and hold sweet converse together.

II. As a second fact, connected with these ministering spirits, let us notice the great velocity with which they can transport themselves from one part of this vast universe to another. And in this circumstance, will be seen the fact to

which I referred when I said, these angels are not governed by the laws which govern matter.

We have one example illustrating the point now before us, in the case of the destroying angel which went throughout the whole length and breadth of the land of Egypt, visiting every family residence throughout the whole realm, in a part of one night. With what immense speed must this messenger of death have passed from house to house, and from city to city, during that piece of a night.

But the most striking example illustrative of this point, which I now remember, will be found in the ninth chapter of Daniel. In this chapter we have an account of a very interesting confession and prayer, poured forth from the inspired heart of this prophet of God, in behalf of Israel, at the close of which the prophet says: "While I was speaking and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people, Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God, for the mountain of my God; yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to *fly swiftly*, touched me about the time of the evening oblation." Dan. ix, 20, 21.

Now, that there is a place somewhere in the vast dominions of the Almighty, called the *heaven of heavens*, the holy place made without hands, where God's glory dwells essentially, all believe who admit the truth of revelation at all. Into this most holy place it was that Christ, the great High Priest of the Christian profession, "entered with his own blood, there to appear in the presence of God for us." How far this holy, happy place may be from the globe which we inhabit, we know not. It may be, and no doubt is far beyond the most distant fixed star that has ever yet been

discovered by the most powerful telescope. I presume that we sing the truth when we say:

"'Tis far beyond the stars and sun,
That blissful heaven above,
Where we may dwell when time is done,
By serving God in love."

Now, suppose it is ninety-five millions of miles to our sun, then suppose the most distant fixed star, seen only by the largest telescopic glasses, to be a sun, equal in magnitude and splendor to our sun, how far must it be to that star which is only perceived by the most powerfully magnifying lenses? And then suppose the Palace Royal of the universe, the supposed center of all the systems of worlds that float in the immensity of space, is far beyond that star, how far must it be? It is beyond all human conception; we have no rules of measurement with which the distance can be computed.

Now it seems that when Daniel commenced this prayer, this angel was at that point, in the immediate presence of the great God. How long the prophet prayed we are not told, but from the account given we would not suppose it occupied more than an hour. While he was praying God saw him; God heard the voice of his supplications, and said to this attendant angel, Go, "*fly swiftly*," to that little globe which was fitted up for the abode of man; go to the city of Babylon, near the great river Euphrates, and on its banks you will find my servant Daniel *praying;* go to him before he concludes this supplication, and reveal to him the important message which I now commit to your charge. In obedience to this command, Gabriel commences his long, long journey, and passing worlds and suns, and multiplied systems of worlds, he comes to the prophet of God, and ere his prayer was concluded, he stood by his side and laid his hand upon

him. The flight of this angel must have far exceeded that of the destroying angel which we have already noticed.

Such, Christian reader, is the character of these ministering angels that minister for the heirs of salvation. Is it not a joyful thought that these swift-winged messengers of the skies are all ministering spirits, sent forth on errands of mercy in behalf of salvation's heirs. Well may we sing:

"How cheering the thought, that the spirits of bliss
Will bow their bright wings to a world such as this—
Will leave the sweet joys of the mansions above,
To breathe in our bosom some message of love."

III. As a third thought in reference to the angels of heaven, let us consider their number. Their precise number is not given in the Bible, but that it is very great many scriptures plainly indicate.

1. When the angel that brought the news of Messiah's birth to the shepherds, made the glorious announcement, "suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly hosts, praising God." Luke ii, 13. The term multitude is indefinite, but it always implies a very great number.

2. When Christ was about to yield himself into the hands of his enemies, he said, "Thinkest thou that I can not pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" Webster defines the term *legion* to mean "A Roman military force, consisting of different numbers of men, at different periods, from three to five thousand." Some say a full Roman legion numbered six thousand. If then, by a legion, the Saviour meant five thousand, which is very probable, as he spake under the Roman government, and in the presence of Roman soldiers,

the number here indicated would be sixty thousand—or, according to some, seventy-two thousand! What a thought! that through prayer offered by the Son of God to his Heavenly Father, at this trying moment, he could have secured the assistance of sixty thousand angels!—nay, more than this, for Jesus said, "*more than twelve legions of angels.*"

3. But again: when Daniel saw, in prophetic vision, the winding up of all our mortal affairs, when the judgment was set and the books were opened, he says, "*thousand thousands* ministered unto him." Daniel vii, 10. Those who shall minister to the Judge on that dreadful occasion, are doubtless these heavenly messengers, for the Lord said he would "send his angels, with a great sound of a trumpet; and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Matt. xxiv, 31. Now, if by *thousands*, only two thousand be meant, which is the lowest number we can take to have a plurality of thousands, the number here intimated would be two millions. But we have just as good reason to suppose that by the plural thousands, ten thousand is meant. This would make the number here indicated ten millions. Indeed, we may consider the number even greater than this, without doing any violence to the scripture under consideration. O, what multitudes "wait on the Lord, hearkening to the word of his mouth."

4. But in conclusion on this point, Paul, speaking of the high honors which belong to those who have become the people of God according to the New Covenant, says, they "have come to an innumerable company of angels." Heb. xii, 22. This puts the number beyond all human computation. And to this innumerable company of angels, the apostle declares that Christians have come. They are brought into fellowship with these unnumbered hosts of angelic spirits, all of whom minister to the children of the

Lord, the heirs of gospel salvation. O, what a pleasing association of thoughts cluster around this Bible truth, when contemplated by the pious mind. O, who would not be a Christian, and thus secure the guardian care of these innumerable hosts of ministering spirits, that wait on the heirs of salvation?

IV. The fourth particular pertaining to angels, that I will notice is, their power. This they have often manifested by exerting upon animate and inanimate matter. David said, "Bless the Lord, ye his angels that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening to the voice of his mouth." Ps. ciii, 20. When David says that angels excel in strength, I suppose he contrasts the strength of angels with that of men, and thus affirms that angels are stronger than men—that they excel in strength the most powerful of our fallen race. Let us notice a few examples of angelic power.

1. In the twelfth chapter of the Acts of Apostles we have an account of the imprisonment of Peter, and of his deliverance by an angel.

Herod, having killed James, the brother of John, and perceiving that this rash act pleased the Jews, "he proceeded further to take Peter also. * * * And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him, intending, after Easter, to bring him forth to the people. Peter, therefore, was kept in prison; but prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him." What an example of Christian piety and devotion, and of brotherly love and affection, is here presented! and how worthy it is of imitation by all the disciples of Christ, in every trying hour! There seem to have been no uninterested members of the church on this occasion. Prayer was made without ceasing *by the church*—not a *part* of the church;

and the prayer was incessant. These were more than mere forms of prayer. They were effectual, fervent prayers, which God has promised to hear, assuring us that such prayers avail much.

These prayers, embalmed by the tears of humble, weeping disciples, came up like holy incense before the Lord, and, in answer thereunto, on the same night on which Herod intended to bring this servant of the Most High God forth to be punished, the Lord sent one of these ministering spirits as a messenger of mercy to his imprisoned apostle; and while he was sleeping between two soldiers, bound with two chains, and while the keepers were standing before the prison, guarding the entrance, "the angel of the Lord came upon him, and a light shined in the prison, and he smote Peter on the side and raised him up, saying, Arise up, quickly; and his chains fell off from his hands. And the angel said unto him, Gird thyself, and bind on thy sandals; and so he did. And he said unto him, Cast thy garments about thee, and follow me." This whole event was so strange and so sudden, that Peter, just aroused out of deep sleep, supposed it was only a vision; but still he followed the angel, until, having "passed the first and second ward, they came to the iron gate that leadeth into the city, which opened to them of its own accord, and they went out and passed on through one street; and forthwith the angel departed from him."

Thus we see that by the mighty arm of one of these celestial messengers was this witness of Christ delivered out of the hands of his enemies. By his powerful but invisible touch, the iron gate, which is said to have been so large that it required twelve men to open it, was thrown open wide to admit the apostle to go free. With joy, he hastened "to the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark,

where many were gathered together, praying." What joy must have filled the pious hearts of these weeping disciples when they received their beloved apostle safe and sound, and heard him declare "how the Lord had delivered him out of prison;" and well may there have been "no small stir among the soldiers to know what had become of Peter!"

2. As a second example of angelic power, I refer to the work of death performed by one angel in a few hours upon the first-born of Egypt. The facts in this case teach us that angels are not omniscient—for, notwithstanding this angel knew the first-born in every family into which he entered, yet when he stood without, at the door of a human habitation, he did not know whether the inmates were Egyptians or Hebrews. Therefore the Lord directed the Israelites to sprinkle blood upon the lintels and door-posts of all their houses, and, doubtless, when the God of the Hebrews sent forth this messenger of death, he gave him special directions not to touch one person found within a blood-sprinkled habitation.

But the point in this example to which I invite special attention is, the amount of this work of death that was performed by one angel in so short a time. About midnight the destroying angel went forth, and long before the dawn of day he had quenched the vital spark of the first-born of every Egyptian family throughout the whole dominions of the mighty Pharaoh. The sacred historian testifies that at midnight the Lord smote the first born in the land of Egypt, "from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on the throne, unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon, and all the first-born of cattle." And is it so that not only this angel, but all the angels, are ministering spirits, ever exerting their power in behalf of those

who shall be heirs of salvation! Bless the Lord, Oh, my soul, for all his kindness to the children of men who seek salvation through the blood of the cross.

3. We have an account of another example of angelic power in connection with the resurrection of Christ. When the Marys came early to the sepulcher to embalm the body of Jesus, they were anxious to know who should roll away the stone which was placed at the door of the tomb, "*for it was very great.*" "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulcher? And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away; for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow; and for fear of him the soldiers did shake and became as dead men." Matt. xxviii, 1, 2, 3. Then it was that God so frustrated the dark purposes of those who "took counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed, that he that sitteth in the heavens laughed, the Lord had them in derision." See Ps. ii, 1, 2, 3. If ever the angels of God laughed at the folly of man, this was the time. To see these hardy Roman soldiers, who had resolved to retain the body of Jesus in the tomb, in despite of all earthly power, and in defiance of the God whom the Jews worshiped—fainting away, and lying as dead men all around the tomb of Joseph, at the visible appearance of one of these ministering spirits—was enough to throw the smile of contempt over the countenances of all the heavenly hosts. Well may the sweet singer of Israel say, "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength."

4. The fourth example exhibiting the power of angels, to which I will refer, is recorded in the thirty-second chapter of 2 Chronicles. At this time Hezekiah, the good

king, reigned in Judah. "And Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came and entered into Judah, and encamped against the fenced cities, and thought to win them for himself. * * * And when Hezekiah saw that Sennacherib was come, and that he was proposed to fight against Jerusalem, * * he set captains of war over the people, and gathered them together unto him in the streets of the city, and spake comfortably unto them, saying, Be strong and courageous, be not afraid nor dismayed for the king of Assyria; * * with him is an arm of flesh; but with us is the Lord God to fight our battles."

"After this did Sennacherib, king of Assyria, send his servants to Jerusalem, (but he himself laid siege to Lachish, and all his power with him), unto Hezekiah, king of Judah, and unto all Judah that was in Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith Sennacherib, king of Assyria, Whereon do you trust, that you abide in the siege in Jerusalem? Doth not Hezekiah persuade you to give over yourselves to die by famine and by thirst, saying, the Lord our God shall deliver us out of the hands of the king of Assyria? * * Know ye not what I and my fathers have done unto all the people of other lands? Were the gods of those lands any ways able to deliver their lands out of my hand? Who was there, among all the gods of those nations that my fathers utterly destroyed, that could deliver his people out of my hand, that your God should be able to deliver you out of my hand? Now, therefore, let not Hezekiah deceive you, nor persuade you on this manner; neither yet believe him, for no god of any nation or kingdom was able to deliver his people out of my hand, and out of the hand of my fathers. How much less shall your God deliver you out of my hands?"

While this proud monarch, surrounded by the mighty hosts of Assyria, was thus defying the God of Abraham,

Isaac, and Jacob, speaking against the God of Jerusalem, as against the gods of other nations, which were made by men's hands, "Hezekiah the king, and the prophet Isaiah, the son of Amos, prayed, and cried to heaven; *and the Lord sent an angel, which cut off all the mighty men of valor, and the leaders, and the captains, in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned with shame of face to his own land.*"

Here is a striking proof of the power of angels, and that they minister to those who put their trust in the living God, and with honest and obedient hearts call upon his holy name. One angel slew all the mighty men in the king's army, and sent him home with shame. Such, Christian reader, is the mighty power of those celestial beings whom God has commissioned to minister to the heirs of gospel grace.

5. I will only mention one more example of angelic power. In the twenty-fourth chapter of 2 Samuel, we are informed that the Lord determined to bring a judgment upon his people for their wickedness. Then "the word of the Lord came unto the prophet Gad, David's seer, saying, Go and say unto David, thus saith the Lord, I offer thee three things; choose thee one of them, that I may do it unto thee. So Gad came to David, and told him, and said unto him, Shall seven years' famine come unto thee in thy land? or, wilt thou flee three months before thine enemies, while they pursue thee? or, that there be three days' pestilence in the land? Now advise and see what answer I shall return unto him that sent me.

"And David said unto Gad, I am in a great strait; let us fall now into the hands of the Lord, for his mercies are great, and let me not fall into the hands of man.

"So the Lord sent a pestilence upon Israel, from the morning, even unto the time appointed; and there

died of the people, from Dan even to Beersheba, seventy thousand men. And when the angel stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem, to destroy it, the Lord repented him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed the people, It is enough; stay now thine hand."

Thus, by one angel, were seventy thousand persons cut off, perhaps in one day, for three days was the whole time allotted for this work of death, and it was arrested long ere it was completed. And let it be remembered that the angel made use of a pestilence, to accomplish this judgment of the Almighty. The people saw not this messenger of death. All they knew was, that some unusual malady had taken hold of the nation, which baffled the skill of their most gifted physicians, and which was very rapid in its operations. But still, this disease was brought upon the nation, and directed in all its desolating ravages, by the invisible hand of one of those heavenly messengers, that wait on all who walk in the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless.

And may it not be the case now, that many of our great national calamities, which afflict our world, is the work of these ministering spirits "that do the commandments of God, hearkening to the voice of his mouth"? How often do new and unheard of diseases break forth upon our race, like a mighty avalanche, sweeping all before it to the grave, when no immediate cause can be discovered? Has not this been the history of the last epidemic which visited our country, and which still lingers about our shores, as if waiting to see who will recognize the hand of God in this affliction, and fear, and turn to the Lord? I have heard many causes assigned for this wonderful malady, but none have yet been discovered which did not exist from time immemorial. It has been asserted that cholera is produced by the impurities of our habitations, and the uncleanness

of our streets and alleys; but, on examination it is found that as much of these impurities existed before this visitation, as at the time of its appearance.

Others have imagined that cholera is caused by an almost invisible insect, which revels in the air, and being inhaled, affects the system in this strange and uncontrollable manner. But when we ask, why did not these insects exist in this country before the year of our Lord 1832? reason and human philosophy are as silent as the grave; they can not answer, because they know not why. The more wise plan is to acknowledge it, and all such visitations, to be chastisements of God, sent on us for our sins, and inflicted, it may be, by the same ministering angel that struck dead the first born of Egypt; or, that slew the mighty men of Assyria; or, that brought to the grave seventy thousand of the seed of Abraham, in a very few hours. And thus acknowledging his mercies and his judgments, we should repent of our sins, and turn to God, and endeavor to "serve him with reverence and godly fear."

Am I told that this fearful scourge afflicted the good and the bad equally? men in the church as well as men out of the church? I answer, that in all great national scourges, the righteous and the unrighteous generally suffer together. This is as it should be, for in most cases of great national wickedness, the sin lies at the door of the church. The church, which should be the salt of the earth and the light of the world, fails to exhibit that light so as to induce others to glorify our Father who is in heaven; the salt loses its savour, and is therefore good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men.

Were I to search for the special sin for which this great scourge was sent, I would not go into the world to find it; I would walk into the sanctuary of God; into the church of Christ, so called. From Rev. xviii, 4. I conclude that if any

one sin more than another, brought this rod of the Almighty upon Christianized lands, it is the sin of partyism, and sectarian strife. By *Babylon*, I understand *confusion;* and the great city called by that name in this connection, I understand to be the whole world, professing the Christian religion, in all their divisions and sub-divisions. The voice from heaven, saying, "come out of her my people," is the voice of the Great Head of the church, calling on the good of all parties to come out of this state of confusion, and to form the one body "on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." And one reason given by that warning voice, why all should obey is, "*that ye be not partaker of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.*" Who knows but that cholera may be one of these very plagues, inflicted by one of those ministering spirits, according to the command of God? I think it very probable, and would not be at all astonished should it be followed up by something still more appalling, unless the church purge herself from this heaven-dishonoring, skeptic-making, soul-ruining sin; the sin of party strife and sectarianism in Christianity.

V. My fifth remark in reference to angels is that they have always taken a deep interest in the affairs of man. We have many very interesting examples showing this fact, some of which we will now notice.

1. The news of Messiah's birth was first announced to man, by an angel. And when this ministering spirit saw that the shepherds were alarmed, and "*sore afraid*," he cheered them, saying, "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people: For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." And, as if to express his concern for their happiness still more fully, he proceeded to tell them where this child could be found, describing its very

raiment, so that they could not fail to find the INFANT CHRIST.

2. But as soon as this announcement was made to the shepherds in the plains of Bethlehem, "suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men," Luke ii, 10—14. The thought that caused this general burst of joy among the angelic host, was the good that should result to man by the Saviour's birth. "GOOD WILL TO MAN" was the very soul of their song. And from this we may learn that much of their attention to Christ was performed for the sake of man. They knew very well, that man had a deep interest in every word the blessed Saviour uttered; in every tear he dropped; in every pain he endured; in every drop of blood he shed. Hence it was that when our Lord had passed that awful conflict with man's worst enemy, and had repelled the fell monster, "*the angels came and ministered unto him*," Matt. iv, 11.

3. When Jesus prayed in the gloomy garden of Gethsemane, until his sweat was as great drops of blood falling to the ground, "*there appeared an angel unto him from heaven strengthening him.*"

Indeed we may adopt the language of one of Zion's songsters, and say:

"Through all his travels here below,
They did his steps attend;
Oft gazed, and wondered where at length,
This scene of love would end.
They heard him in the garden pray,
They saw his sweat of blood;
They saw his tender hands and feet,
Nailed to the cursed wood.
They brought his chariot from the skies
To bear him to his throne;
And, with a shout, exulting cried,
The dreadful work is done."

4. When Jesus rose from the tomb, the disciples, not knowing that he had risen, came very early in the morning for the purpose of embalming the Lord's body. But when they came, "they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre; and they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments. And as they were afraid and bowed down their faces to earth, they said unto them; WHY SEEK YE THE LIVING AMONG THE DEAD? He is not here but is risen. Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee." Luke xxiv, 2, 6.

This example furnishes two facts of interest. First, these angels show their feeling for the disciples. They saw these disciples seeking the body of Jesus, and when they could not find that precious body, they saw how they were perplexed and troubled; therefore, sympathising with them, they became visible, and told them the joyful news of the Lord's resurrection.

The second fact to which I refer, is, that these angels knew what Jesus had told the disciples while in Galilee. "Remember," said they, "how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, the son of man must be betrayed into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." When Jesus told this to his disciples in Galilee, there is no account of any angels being present. The disciples saw them not, but still they were there; and, though they were invisible to mortal eyes, they heard the conversation which passed between Christ and his disciples, and they understood it, but the disciples did not. But, as kind friends, they now remind them of the precious words which Jesus had spoken to them before his death.

5. As a fifth example expressive of the interest which angels take in the welfare of man, I will refer the reader

to the fact, that *there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.*" Luke xv, 10.

Yes, when one poor sinner, who has lived in rebellion against the Lord of men and angels, sees the evil of his ways, reforms his life, and becomes obedient to the faith, the angels of God, in heaven, rejoice; they tune their golden harps anew, and sound the loud note of praise to him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb. And shall not the church join in the general chorus of praise at the conversion of sinners to God? And shall we not labor more zealously for their conversion, that they may be saved, that we may be made glad, and that the angels of heaven may rejoice.

6. We have another interesting example illustrative of this point, which occurred at the ascension of Christ. He held his last personal interview with his disciples on the mount of Olives; and while he was there giving them his parting advice, "he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight." Acts i, 9.

What a trial this must have been. These disciples had just passed through three days sorrow for the death of their Divine Master. Oh, what days these must have been! Their enemies laughing them to scorn for having followed an impostor, who was now crucified, dead and buried; and no friend to comfort them. But Jesus had risen from among the dead, and thus their fears were dispelled, their hope returned, and they again rejoiced in him who they trusted would soon redeem Israel. But they did not yet understand the nature of his kingdom, nor the part they were to take in setting it up. Still, believing his reign would be personal, they never expected to be parted from him again. High must have been their expectation, when they said unto him, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" But, refusing a direct answer, he refers them to a time when all things should be

made plain to them; and all at once, right in their sight, he began to ascend. What astonishment must have filled every heart. How intensely must they have gazed after him as he left our sin-stained world, and pursued his upward flight toward the throne of God. Well may they stand gazing up into the aerial heavens, long after their ascending Lord had disappeared beyond the rolling clouds.

But while they stood thus gazing up in the direction their Lord had gone, two of these ministering spirits that formed his celestial escort, turning their eyes toward the point from which they left our earth, saw the disciples yet gazing after them, and, moved with compassion, they returned and comforted them with these blessed words: "This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go up into heaven." Thus it is seen, that notwithstanding these angels were exulting with triumphant joy at the ascension of the Son of God to his native heaven, and the entire escort was composed of pure celestial beings, and their golden wings were bearing them higher, and yet higher, still, they did not forget the disappointed mourners they had left behind. Such, dear reader, is the kindness of those ministering spirits whom God sends forth to minister for the heirs of salvation.

7. When John, the beloved apostle, "was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ," an angel was sent to comfort him; and to reveal to him, and through him to the seven churches in Asia, and through them to all the world, things that were yet to come.

8. One more example under this head must suffice. Reader, look yonder: do you see that palace, bearing all the marks of wealth and luxury? See that rich man, clothed in purple and fine linen, promenading his gaudy

halls; surrounded by many courtiers, ever ready to flatter his vanity. His table is furnished with all that a pampered appetite can demand.

But what is that I hear? It sounds like the voice of suffering humanity. Look yonder, at that rich man's gate; there lies a poor beggar, all full of putrifying sores—and he is dying of hunger! Will not that rich man hear his groans? Will he not have compassion upon him? Oh, no! this beggar is beneath his notice—he can not stoop so low as to give him a morsel of bread.

But see; the poor man grows more feeble. His pulse beats faint and few; life is ebbing; there, he is dead! The earthly tabernacle has fallen; but the man has walked out, and now, see—there are the angels of heaven all around him! They have watched him in this last trying hour, and now they invite him to join their company, while they bear him to the Paradise of God. Thus do these ministering spirits attend the heirs of salvation through all their journeyings here below, and soothe them in the hour of death; and, after death, they convey them to the land of rest—the saint's delight. Yes—

> "They come, on the wings of the morning, they come,
> Impatient to lead some poor wanderer home;
> Some pilgrim to snatch from this stormy abode,
> And lay him to rest in the arms of his God."

To me it is a pleasing reflection, that the angels of heaven take such an abiding interest in our present and eternal well-being. But what must be the feelings of these celestial messengers when they see a disciple of Christ violating the law of God! If Paul taught the churches that their public assemblies should present a respectful and dignified appearance "*because of the angels*," (see 1 Cor. xi), may we not apply the same thought to our every day's conduct,

and say that our conversation should be as becometh the gospel, "because of the angels that encamp around us?"

But angels are only *ministering* spirits. They are not *mediators.* To us there is but "one mediator—the man Christ Jesus." They are not objects of worship—nor are they to be addressed in prayer. This may be one reason why so few of their names are given in the Bible. Man is so prone to adore the creature more than the Creator—hence, it may have been wise in God to conceal the names of these celestial messengers, lest men should be led to worship them. We have the names of a few of these ministering spirits, and to every one whose name is given have divine honors been paid. What multitudes of prayers and praises have been offered up to Michael and Gabriel by him whose working is after Satan, and those who regard the man of sin as Christ's vicegerent on earth. This is idolatry. Angels are not gods; but God's ministers, who do his will, hearkening to the voice of his mouth. "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation."

We never shall fully know, in this life, the many blessings, spiritual and temporal, which we have enjoyed by these heavenly messengers. All Christians believe in the providence of God, and many believe in his *special providence.* Have we not sufficient evidence in the Holy Scriptures to justify us in saying that God's providential care is exercised through the agency of these heavenly messengers? When Daniel was cast into the lion's den, the Lord sent an angel to shut the lions' mouths, so they could not hurt the prophet of the Most High God. An angel stood by the side of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, and quenched the violence of the fire, and thus saved these worshipers of the true God from destruction by fire. On a certain occasion, the Syrians resolved to destroy Elisha, the man of God, and

disperse the hosts of Israel. Therefore their king "sent thither horses and chariots, and a great host, and they came by night, and compassed the city about."

"When the servant of the man of God was risen early, and gone forth, behold a host compassed the city, both with horses and chariots. And his servant said unto him, Alas, my master! how shall we do?" This servant seemed to think that they could not stand against such a mighty host. But "Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw, and behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." By these celestial messengers, was the prophet preserved, and Israel saved.

And may it not be the case with the people of God, even in these latter days, that when they see insurmountable difficulties before them, and scarcely know what to do, that if their eyes were opened, as were the eyes of Elisha's servant, they would see multitudes of these ministering spirits around them, ready and able to level the mountains before them, and make the path of duty plain and easy. Yes, dear reader, they attend the Christian through all his pilgrimage here below. As God's commissioned messengers, they go before his people, travelling through this wilderness of sin, and when they come to Jordan, they smooth its turbid waves, and conduct the emancipated spirit to the Paradise of God.

"Here stop, my soul,
No farther seek to go;
What God reveals
Is quite enough for thee to know."

One thought more, and I will leave the subject to the meditations of the reader.

These ministering spirits are sent forth *to minister for*

the heirs of salvation. And who are they? Who shall inherit the salvation offered to a sinking world, through Jesus Christ our Lord? Reader, attend, while an inspired witness of God answers this momentous question: "Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, *he became the author of eternal salvation* UNTO ALL THEM THAT OBEY HIM.

Then, in order to be the heirs of this great salvation, we must obey the Lord. This, of course applies to those who have hearts to understand his will, and power to obey that will. As to little children, the blessing of Christ rests upon them without an obedience which they are not able to perform. But in reference to those who have hearts to understand his will, and capacities to serve God in doing good, he has made obedience a condition of salvation.

Let all, then, who desire to share the guardian care of God, through the agency of these ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for the heirs of salvation, be very careful to render an acceptable service to the Lord, and then, when time has run its course, "He shall send his angels with a great sound OF A TRUMPET, AND THEY SHALL GATHER TOGETHER HIS ELECT FROM THE FOUR WINDS, FROM ONE END OF HEAVEN TO THE OTHER." For "THE HARVEST IS THE END OF THE WORLD, AND THE REAPERS ARE THE ANGELS"

SERMON XIII.

THE CHRISTIAN WARFARE AND THE MIND OF CHRIST.

Forasmuch, then, as Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind. 1 Pet. iv, 1.

In this scripture, the apostle contemplates Christians as engaged in a holy war; and now, that they may gain the victory, he commands them to take to themselves the mind of Christ as an armor; and this he enforces by the sufferings of Christ.

Our enemies in this conflict may be summed up under three heads, viz: the world, the flesh, and the Devil. The term *world* may apply to the riches, honors and pleasures of this world; or to those who have not become the disciples of Christ. The Saviour said to his followers, "*Ye are not of the world.*"

The riches of this world may well be called an enemy to the Christian, because, if they gain his affections too much, they will lead him to disobey that command which says: "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth." Col. iii, 2. The honor of this world is an enemy to grace, because he who is overcome by it is sure to neglect that "honor which comes from God only." The pleasures and amusements of this world may be considered as enemies to the Christian, because if they control his heart, they will lead him to forsake the assemblies of the saints,

and the throne of grace, where alone he can obtain strength to "serve the Lord acceptably."

Under the term flesh, we may consider all the works of the flesh—some of which the apostle sums up thus: "Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." To this dark list may be added, evil surmising, deceit, evil speaking, back-biting, etc. These are all enemies to the Christian, because when they rule in the heart, they are sure to lead to the violation of some of the commands found in the perfect law of liberty.

The Devil is always spoken of in the scriptures as an enemy to God, and all goodness. He superintends and controls in all the dominions of darkness, and hence he is called the prince of demons—the father of lies—and the accuser of the brethren. He is said to walk about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, and Paul says, "We are not ignorant of his devices."

Thus we have briefly noticed some of the evil powers against which we are contending in the Christian warfare. These must be overcome, subdued, and resisted, if we would gain the crown of glory, which is unfading, in heaven.

But there is another object in this struggle for victory. Christians are not only to subdue and resist these evils, so as to secure their own salvation, but they are to make encroachments on the ranks of the enemy. By precept, example, and religious influence, they are, as far as possible, to put away from the circle in which they move, all the evil and vicious practices which prevail among the ungodly, and take as many prisoners of war as possible, and make them the willing subjects of the kingdom of Christ. To gain this point, the world must be taught the ways of righteousness—they must be gained by moral means. This

is a war of influence, and whether the church or the world conquer, depends on the influence which they exert. The party which wields the greatest amount of influence will be the most successful.

Now, that we may accomplish all the designs of our profession, the apostle says, Arm yourselves with the mind of Christ.

But what is meant by the MIND OF CHRIST?

Taylor, in his Concordance, gives, *end, design, or intention,* as some of the meanings of the word *mind.* Dr. A. Clark comments on 1 Pet. iv, 1, thus:

"*As Christ hath suffered.*]—He is your proper pattern; have the same disposition he had; the same forgiving spirit, with meekness, gentleness, and complete self-possession."

McKnight, in his notes on this scripture, says:

"Arm yourselves with the same mind.]—Christ having suffered in the flesh, that is, in his embodied state, to arm ourselves against our persecutors with the same mind, is to arm ourselves with the same resolution to suffer all the evils to which we are exposed in the body, and particularly to suffer death when called by God to do so for our religion."

He also renders Phil. ii, 5, thus:

"Wherefore let this disposition be in you which was even in Christ."

From these authorities, and many others which might be adduced, we learn that when the apostle commands us to to arm ourselves with the mind of Christ, he intended that we should have the same disposition, end, design, intention, resolution, and fixed purpose which actuated our Lord and Saviour when he tabernacled among men.

It only remains, then, for us to consider the disposition and purpose of Christ, in order to understand the obligation laid upon us by this command.

1. *Christ possessed the mind, or disposition of condescension.* "He that was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich." Of Christ the apostle says: "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. ii, 6, 7, 8.

Here we see condescension unequaled by men or angels. The Lord of glory condescended from the throne of the Universe, to the cradle, to the cross, to the grave. And all this for the good of others. Yea, even for the good of his enemies!

Now, if Christians would conquer the evils to which they are exposed, they must possess the same condescending mind. Paul says, "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits." Rom. xii, 16.

2. *Christ possessed the mind of humility.* He was humble in mind: he did not seek the praise of men: "he did not strive, nor cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets." He did not seek the society of the rich to the neglect of the poor. He occupied the humbler walks of life; and was always ready to hear the voice of suffering humanity; and to relieve the wants of the distressed, though they were of the lower and humbler classes of mankind. Christians, have the same mind.

3. *Christ was disposed to do good unto all men*, by teaching them the good and the right way; by comforting the distressed, healing the sick, and pouring the oil of consolation into the broken heart. Go, Christian, and do likewise, so far as you have it in your power.

4. *Christ had the mind of sympathy.* He wept with

with those that wept. See yonder, in Bethany, reside two sisters. They have one only brother; but the hand of affliction is laid upon him, and he sinks in the cold arms of death, and is laid in the silent tomb. Jesus approaches the humble dwelling of these disconsolate sisters; he beholds them weeping, and the Jews weeping with them, and—"JESUS WEPT." Christians, arm yourselves with the same mind.

5. *Christ was disposed to honor his Father rather than himself.* He said, "I seek not my own glory. I receive not honor of men. To the Jews he said, "I honor my Father, but you dishonor me." To his heavenly Father he said, "I have glorified thee upon the earth."

That Christians may overcome all the vicious influences of this bewitching and fascinating world, they must possess this same strong desire to honor God; it must be their chief concern to "glorify God in their bodies and spirits, which are the Lord's." They must desire the honor of God more than the praise of men.

6. *Christ had the mind of prayer and thanksgiving.* Often did he absent himself from the crowd, and retire into solitary places to pray; and on one occasion he "*continued all night in prayer to God.*" Often did the feelings of his righteous soul break forth in praise and thanksgiving to God. When about to raise Lazarus from the dead, he lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." Christians, seek the same mind of prayer and praise.

7. *Christ was long-suffering.* When he was reviled, he reviled not again: he did not "render evil for evil, but contrarywise blessing." When he was abused, buffeted, and spit upon, he never resented it, but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously. So should Christians do, if they would conquer.

8. *Christ was resigned to the will of God in all things.*

He said, "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me; my meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." When praying in the dark and gloomy garden of Gethsemane, in view of the ignominious death of the cross, he said, "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done." Let Christians, then, be resigned to all the dispensations of God's providence.

Now, while the soldiers of the cross are contending, "not against flesh and blood only, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places," the apostle commands them, saying "ARM YOURSELVES WITH THE MIND THAT WAS IN CHRIST." Have that condescending, humble, long-suffering, sympathizing disposition which characterized our Lord and Saviour. O! have that deep-settled purpose to honor God, and to do his will in all things, which Christ possessed; and under all circumstances be disposed to say, not my will, but thine be done.

Come, my Christian readers, let us examine ourselves on each of these points, in the fear of God. Have we the mind of Christ? Do we possess, in a good degree, that anxious desire for the glory of God, and the salvation of sinners, that dwelt in the bosom of our blessed Lord? Can we suffer long and be kind, in imitation of Christ our pattern? Remember, that, if we would wear the crown, we must conquer; and if we would conquer, we must have the mind of Christ. Let no Christian say that he can not obtain that mind. We are commanded to have it; and as no impossibilities are required of God's people, we can arm ourselves with that mind.

But in order to do this, an effort must be made. We never can obtain that disposition by sitting down and whiningly saying, *I can't* do it. To obey any command requires

an effort; but we are commanded to have the mind of Christ: then we must strive to obtain it.

III. Having seen what is meant by the mind of Christ, we now proceed to point out some of the means by which Christians may obtain that mind.

The apostle Peter says that the divine power has "given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that by these you might be partakers of the divine nature." Now, by the divine nature, I understand the mind of Christ. He who has the mind of Christ, as described above, has as much of the divine nature as it is possible for mortal man to possess. This mind, or nature, then, is to be received through the promises given by the divine power. The same idea is expressed by Paul, thus: "But we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." From these scriptures, we see that the mind of Christ, or the moral image of the Lord, is to be received through the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour.

But in order to receive the divine impression upon our hearts, which the gospel is designed to make, we must bring the mind and gospel in contact. By faith, we must let the word of God dwell in our hearts richly, or abundantly. The type never can impress its image on the paper, until they are brought in contact; so the glory of God, as revealed in the gospel, makes no impression on the heart, until the heart and gospel are brought together by faith and prayerful meditation. The gospel is here represented as a mirror, in which is portrayed the glory of the Lord, before the believer's mind, and by looking steadfastly at it, it fastens its divine impression upon the beholder's heart, until he is changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord.

This view shows the importance of the following apostolic admonition: "Let the word of God dwell in you richly, in all wisdom." David said, "Thy word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against thee;" and he pronounced a special blessing on those who "delight in the law of the Lord, and meditate thereon day and night."

Thus we see, that when David was exposed to temptation—when he saw his spiritual enemies rallying their forces against him, in order that he might be able to meet and repel them, he hid the word of God in his heart—he gave it a deep place in his affections, and reflected on it day and night, and thus received a portion of the mind which indited that word, and thereby was he fully armed for the conflict. Christian soldier, go thou and do likewise.

To enable us to treasure up the word of God in our hearts, and retain it there, the good Lord has appointed the institutions of his house. The Lord's people have always been more steadfast in his service when the ordinances of his house were regularly attended to, than when they were neglected. The experience of David, recorded in the seventy-third Psalm, is a good lesson for us. When David had absented himself, for a while, from the house of God, he became envious at the wicked, and was ready to say, "Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, I have washed my hands in innocency; for all the day long have I been plagued, and chastened every morning." Hence, he says, "My feet were almost gone, my steps were well nigh slipped." But he continues, "When I went into the sanctuary of God, then understood I their end; surely, thou didst set them on slippery places; thou castest them down to destruction." Thus you perceive, that while David neglected the sanctuary of God, and mingled with the ungodly, he began to drink into the spirit of the world, until he

almost came to the conclusion that his religion was worth nothing. In this state of mind, he was poorly prepared to do battle for his King. But when he came into the sanctuary of God, how soon his mind was changed. Here the law was read, from which he was reminded of the end of the wicked; here were seen the emblems of the divine presence, in the twelve loaves of shew-bread; here was seen, burning upon the golden altar, sweet incense, the fragrance of which ascended up before the cherubims which overshadowed the mercy seat, where the divine shekinah dwelt: and while he mused, the fire burned, and the spirit of devotion was again kindled upon the altar of his heart, and he exclaimed, "My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forevermore. Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee. Thou shalt guide me by thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." Now he could say, "I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness. Blessed are all they which dwell in thy house, for they will still be praising thee."

Now the church of God is the antitype of the sanctuary in which David worshiped; and hence Paul calls it "the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the ground and pillar of the truth." Here, then, Christians are to come and worship, that they may obtain "grace to serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear." Here the songs of Zion are sung, the gospel is read, prayers are offered up to the Lord MOST HIGH, exhortations are given, and the dying love of our Lord and Saviour is commemorated in the emblematic LOAF and CUP—and thus Christians remember him that endured such contradictions of sinners against himself, and neither weary nor faint in their minds. They are thus strengthened with might, by the spirit in

the inner man, being filled with the mind that was in Christ our Lord.

Now, let no one say that he can not have the mind of Christ, in some good degree, and thus overcome the evils to which he is exposed, while he neglects these means of grace. As well might a soldier complain of his inability to conquer his enemy, when the only cause of his weakness is that he is too lazy to eat, as for a Christian to be always complaining of his want of spiritual strength, while he neglects Bible reading and meditation, and the public worship of God in his spiritual house. Let all try the Lord's means of grace, before they complain of the Master for requiring more than they can perform.

Let me say to the brethren everywhere, that there is a mighty struggle now in progress, between truth and error, vice and virtue, the church and the world, the kingdom of darkness and the kingdom of God's dear Son; and we have taken up arms in favor of our Lord Messiah; we have enlisted in his divine cause; and now, that we may gain the victory, we must have the mind of Christ—and that we may have that mind, these means must be employed.

Let no one say the battle is over; that there is now no danger. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Paul says, "be not high minded, but fear." Who that is acquainted with the present condition of the religious world, but must admit that the spirit of the world has almost triumphed over the spirit of Christianity!

In rolling a large stone over a steep eminence, how hard it is to gain the summit. Just at this point an unusual effort seems to be necessary, for failing here, it will begin to descend toward the place from whence it was brought, and unless soon arrested in its downward course, it will gather strength as it goes, so that nothing can stand before it, till

it reaches its former resting place. Just so with the cause of Christianity for which we plead. We have come to the summit; to the turning point at which the future destiny of the cause is to be decided. It does seem to me that the ball of reformation has almost come to a stand; it seems to be on the very pivot; failing here will prove our everlasting ruin. O, then, let us make one more powerful, united, and simultaneous effort to gain the summit.

In all wars there have been decisive battles; battles which decided the fate of both armies. Well, the decisive battle between the contending powers of which we now speak, is soon to be fought. I do believe that more depends upon the efforts of the brethren during the next eighteen months, than ever did on the same length of time through which we have come, and therefore I wish to sound the alarm throughout the camps of Israel. *

Reader, I do not write merely because it is necessary to fill up the book; I do feel, deeply, the importance of these suggestions. While we seem to have slacked our efforts, the enemy is busily engaged. He is surrounding our camps; some foes are already among us, and if we do not fly to our arms soon, the day will be lost. Then let us buckle on the armor anew, and go into the action with fresh vigor, and redoubled energy, resolved on victory or death.

Let every member of every congregation resolve before God, that they will not let one day pass without offering up a prayer to God, either in secret or in their families, in behalf of bleeding Zion; that they will read and study the Bible more than they have ever done; that they will labor more for the cause than ever; and that they will meet with the Lord's people in the Lord's house, on every Lord's day if it is possibly in their power to attend; and let this

* This was written when our nation was just entering upon a great political canvass, but most of it is applicable at this moment.

resolution be complied with for six months, and then let reports be made, and I confidently believe that such glad "NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES," has never yet been heard as would resound throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Now reader, say, will you do it? O, remember that the cause of God, your soul's salvation, and the salvation of your neighbors, and your neighbors' children demand such an effort of every disciple of Christ. Remember that the voice of God yet says, "*Woe to them that are at ease in Zion.*"

May the Lord rouse us all from our slumber by his goodness, before we are wakened by the breaking forth of his mighty wrath, upon a sleeping church and wicked world.

Having noticed some of the evil powers which stand opposed to the saints of the MOST HIGH, and the importance of having the mind of Christ, in order to overcome them, as well as the means by which his mind is to be obtained, we will now consider the argument employed by the apostle Peter, to enforce upon us the command to arm ourselves with the mind of Christ. The argument is in the text: "*forasmuch then as Christ* HAS SUFFERED FOR US IN THE FLESH, *arm yourselves likewise with the same mind.*"

Thus you perceive that the sufferings of Christ are made use of as an argument to influence Christians to seek that mind which our Lord possessed.

Then, Christian reader, let us consider for a few moments the suffering scenes through which our blessed Lord has passed on our account.

1. *He suffered poverty.* "He that was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we, through his poverty, might be rich." 2 Cor. viii, 9. Although he possessed a glory with the Father before the world was, he disrobed himself of that glory, and stooped to our low estate, and became so poor that he said, "the foxes have holes and the birds of the air have

nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head," Matt. viii, 20.

2. *He suffered hunger.* When in the temptation in the wilderness, it is said, "Jesus hungered." That he might be fully prepared to sympathize with suffering humanity, he took upon him, not the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham, and thus exposed himself to all the sufferings of which our nature is susceptible. Who can express the pain of hunger? this our Lord endured.

3 *He suffered weariness.* While traveling up and down upon the face of our sin-polluted earth, on errands of love and mercy, one of his witnesses says that he came to Jacob's well, and being wearied with his journey, he sat upon the well. John iv, 6. O! what a sight! The Son of God, who once dwelt in glory inaccessible by flesh and blood, now almost ready to faint under the scorching rays of the meridian sun, sits himself down to rest. Christian soldier, by this scene would the apostle urge it upon you to arm yourself with the mind of Christ.

4. *He suffered persecution.* He was persecuted even by his own countrymen. His name was cast out as evil, and all the stigmas, and sarcasms of a wicked world were poured upon him in one continual storm, while he dwelt among men. He suffered a kind of persecution which is of all the most trying. When he was doing good, and performing such acts of benevolence as never had been witnessed by men before, they imputed his good works to evil motives; they said he cast out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of demons. O, how trying this must have been! Perhaps there is no persecution that tries the Christian more than to have his motives called in question, when he is doing all he can for the good of man. Such trials did our Saviour endure.

5. *He suffered sorrow.* The tongue of men or angels never can express the deep sorrows through which our

humble Lord passed while here on earth. On that dark and doleful night on which he was betrayed, he came with his disciples "to a place called Gethsemane, and said unto them, sit ye here while I go yonder and pray. And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, my soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," Matt. xxvi, 36, 37, 38. By all the anguish and deep sorrow of his righteous soul the apostle would enforce it upon the followers of our Lord and Saviour to take upon them the mind of Christ.

6. *He suffered the scoffs and derisions of wicked men.* Matthew thus testifies: "Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. And they stripped him and put on him a scarlet robe. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, king of the Jews," Matt. xxvii, 27, 28, 29. But "when he was reviled, he reviled not again, but committed himself to him that judgeth rightly."

7. *He suffered buffeting and scourging.* When the high priest decided that he was guilty of blasphemy for saying he was the Son of God, he said to the infuriated mob, "what think ye? They answered and said, he is guilty of death. Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee? And they took the reed and smote him on the head." When Isaiah, the Evangelical prophet, saw, by inspiration, the sufferings of Christ, he said of him, "many were astonished at him, his visage was marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we

hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows, yet we did not esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." Is. lii, 14; liii, 3—5.

8 *He suffered thirst.* "And after this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, saith, I THIRST."

Dr. Clarke says: "The fatigue which he had undergone, the grief he had felt, the heat of the day, and the loss of blood were the natural causes of this thirst."

How painfully distressing this suffering must have been! Intense thirst under ordinary circumstances is very distressing; but when this was augmented by all the anguish of soul, and loss of blood, which our blessed Lord sustained, how immense must his suffering have been! Christians, let this suffering move us to seek the mind of Christ.

9. HE SUFFERED DEATH. Yes, he not only died, but he suffered the ignominious death of the cross! The sun refused to behold sufferings so great, and so shameful, and vailed his face in awful darkness for three long, tedious hours. THE earth felt the dreadful shock, and trembled with astonishment; the solid rocks, as if sympathizing with the dying Lord, were burst asunder; and that blue vail which had for ages and centuries secreted the most holy place from the gaze of the multitude, was rent in twain from top to bottom. "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the spirit."

Now by all these dreadful sufferings of the captain of our salvation, the apostle urges the soldiers of the cross to arm

themselves with the mind of Christ. And can any fail to feel the force of this argument?

If the Saviour of sinners suffered all these dreadful afflictions on our account; if he poured out his heart's blood for the purpose of establishing his kingdom in our world, shall not we who claim to be his friends, and who have espoused his cause, contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints? Shall not we be willing to suffer reproach for that holy cause? O! Yes, let us fight the good fight of faith, that we may finally lay hold on eternal life; and that we may overcome and sit down on his throne as he has overcome and sat down with his Father on his throne. O, let us have THE MIND OF CHRIST.

SERMON XIV.

THE GRACE OF GOD.

Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. Heb. xii, 28.

In this scripture, we are taught the interesting fact that the kingdom of Christ can not be moved; that, notwithstanding all earthly kingdoms, principalities and dominions shall be hurled down to destruction, yet the kingdom of Christ shall stand unshaken amidst the crash of empires and the wreck of earthly governments.

This being the case, the apostle exhorts the subjects of this kingdom to "have grace to enable them to serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear," that they may enjoy the holy privileges and undying benefits of this kingdom in this life and that which is to come.

From the nature of this command, we draw the following conclusions:

1. To enjoy an interest in the kingdom of Christ, we must render an acceptable service to God

2. That our service may be acceptable to God, it must be performed with reverence and godly fear.

3. That this acceptable service can not be performed without God's gracious assistance. Hence, if our service is not acceptable to God, it is because we have not grace to

serve him aright, or else, having the grace, we do not use it in his service.

4. That this grace may be obtained by all Christians. If not, then are we commanded to have that which we can not obtain, and thus an impossibility would be required of us. This would make the commandments of God grievous, which the apostle assures us is not the case.

Now, the truth of the first two of the above conclusions is not denied by any, and when we call to remembrace what Christians, as individuals, and as churches, are required to do, the truth of the third will be admitted in a moment. Christians are represented as the light of the world. They are to be the great means, in the hands of God, of showing forth Christianity in all its practical bearings on human character. This is to be done by living example. Read Paul's praise of the church at Thessalonica: "In every place, your faith to God-ward is spread abroad, so that we need not to speak anything." Had any person in the bound of this church asked Paul anything about Christian fidelity, character, or worship, he need not say anything on the subject. He had only to refer him to the church. There he would have seen the whole will of God presented in a practical illustration—in a living picture that speaks to the heart. Thus was this church a letter of commendation to the name and cause of Christ, known and read of all men. And such should every Christian congregation be, down to the present time.

2. Again, Christians are called the "SALT OF THE EARTH." This phrase may have a two-fold meaning:

1. If there had been ten righteous persons found in the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, God would have saved the cities for their sake. Then these few righteous persons would have been the salt of the cities—they would have possessed the preserving qualities which would have saved

the cities from an overthrow by fire. The prophet says: "Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom," etc. Is. i, 8. This small remnant, then, saved the nation from utter destruction—they were the salt of the nation. So Christians are to be the salt of the earth, in this sense. I have not one doubt but that the whole world would have met Sodom's fate long ere now, had it not been for the small pittance of righteousness that has at all times been found upon the earth.

2. In the second place, the church is to act upon the world as salt, in influencing them to obey the gospel, that they may be saved with a spiritual and an eternal salvation.

3. In order to accomplish this glorious end, Christians must "abstain from wordly lusts that war against the soul. They must deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, and righteously, and godly in this present world." They must be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord. One ungodly act, performed by a professed Christian, may neutralize the efforts of a whole church for weeks, and drown many souls in perdition.

4. Another means by which Christians are to exert the intended influence upon the world is, *the union of Christians.* This is of such infinite importance that I have set it down as a distinct item in the Christian's *high calling.* Christ said: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John xvii, 20, 21. Unless Christians love one another with pure hearts, fervently, and show to the world that they are not strangers and foreigners, but that they are fellow-citizens, of the same household, they

can not exert all that influence on the world which the Lord requires.

These few remarks must suffice to direct the reader's mind to the great work in which he is engaged, if he has taken upon him the holy profession of Christianity. For a full understanding of his whole duty—the entire work he has engaged to do—I refer him to the Book of books, the Bible.

Now, when we consider the evils which surround us—the temptations to which we are exposed—the prevalent vices against which we have to contend—and the rulers of the darkness of this world, and the spiritual wickedness in high places, which stand up against us, who is so ignorant as to venture on the holy enterprise in his own feeble strength? Who does not see the truth of our third conclusion? When we take a proper view of the whole subject of Christian duty and Christian obligation, we are ready to exclaim, "*Lord, save, or we perish!*" But in the midst of our deep anxiety, when despair is just about to throw her dark mantle over us forever, the Saviour speaks in his holy word, saying: "Fear not; be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." "I will be a present help in every time of need." "My grace shall be sufficient for you."

The word translated *grace* in this verse, is *charis*, which means favor, favorable assistance, which shows that although we are not able to perform all the work which the Lord has assigned us, in our own strength, yet the Heavenly Father has promised all necessary aid. In view of this fact, the apostle says, "Let us come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. iv, 16.

But the question now arises, Is this grace to be obtained through visible means, or without means? Is this favorable aid to be communicated in some secret invisible manner,

while we are lying still and doing nothing for the Master's cause? Or, can we expect more grace when we do not use what we have, in the Lord's service? Remember, the Lord did not give ten talents to the servant who would not occupy one.

Now, we assume that the good Lord imparts his gracious aid through ordinances, some of which I will proceed to notice. And for the purpose of presenting this matter, with all its importance, to the reader's mind, I will contrast the kingdom of the *wicked one* with the kingdom of *God's dear son*. That the Devil has a kingdom, will not be denied. Christ says: "If Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?" Matt. xii, 26. Thus does our Lord admit that Satan has a kingdom.

In this kingdom there are rulers; hence the apostle teaches that we wrestle not against flesh and blood only, but against principalities, against powers, against the RULERS of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Eph. vi, 12. These *rulers* are those who go foremost in the commission of crime. They may be called leaders in the practice of vice. Some such persons are to be found in almost every community. They are spoken of and looked to as those that go before and take the lead in all the vices and crimes that are committed in the circle where they move. Now, these rulers are those who have the most strength to commit crime, who seem to have least remorse of conscience, who can practice vice at noon-day, in the face of the world, and even laugh at their own crimes.

Now, I ask, how came they so? Had they always the same power to commit sin that they now possess? Every person who has paid any attention to this subject answers in the negative. These "leaders of the darkness of this world" can now take delight in crimes that they

would once have trembled to think of committing. They had not then the courage, or strength, to resist the dictates of an enlightened judgment, and face a Bible-reading community in the commission of crime. They were not then fit to be rulers in the kingdom of the prince of darkness. How, then, have they gained so much strength? I answer emphatically, *through ordinances.* Ordinances!! Are there ordinances in the kingdom of Satan? Yes, reader, there are, and the strength to commit sin is commonly communicated through them.

I will name some of these institutions: evil associations, the theater, the ball-room, the card-table, the horse-race, together with all the established rules on such occasions—the *tippling-shop*, the groggery, also occupies a very conspicuous place among these ordinances.

Now, take a person who is indifferent on the subject of vice—who is rather inclined to be moral—and let him attend these ordinances regularly, for a time, giving his whole heart to them, and the change for the worse will soon become visible. All who know him, will perceive that he is waxing worse and worse. In this way, he will soon obtain strength and unblushing fortitude sufficient to be a ruler in the kingdom of darkness. I may here be permitted to exhort all who wish to avoid the formation of such a character, never to go to these ordinances, but shun them as you would deadly poison.

Suppose a person, through faith in the gospel of Christ, commences a life of obedience to the Lord. He confesses his faith in God's Son, reforms his life, and is baptized into the body of Christ, the church. Let him then make the vicious his constant companions, and let him attend these ordinances regularly, how long will he maintain his Christian character? how long will he have "grace to serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear"?

He endures but for a while—and why? Because he has not strength to stand up against the temptations presented. And why has he not strength? Because he has not the grace of God helping him. And why is this so? Because he has gone to the wrong place to get it. The ordinances which he has attended, and in which he has walked, all have a contrary effect, and under this influence he falls.

Our Lord and Saviour, then, understanding what is in man—being well acquainted with his whole moral nature—has established ordinances in his kingdom, his immovable kingdom, through which to communicate grace to his followers, to enable them to render an acceptable service to God. For, as before stated, God's grace is always bestowed through ordinances, and never without them. And unless a miracle be performed for our special benefit, we never need expect his grace, unless we attend his ordinances. Such miracles are not now to be expected; hence the importance of becoming acquainted with all the ordinances of grace which the great head of the church has established for our eternal well-being, and the necessity of walking in these ordinances, blamelessly, all our allotted time on earth.

I will now point out some of these ordinances of grace, which belong to the kingdom of God's dear Son.

1. *Secret prayer* is one of much importance. Our Lord says, "Enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret; and thy Father who seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." Matt. vi, 6. This open reward may consist, in part, of grace, to enable us to serve him before the face of all men.

2. *Family worship*—consisting in Bible reading, singing, prayer, and teaching. This may be considered the oldest ordinance now standing, and all who have tried it, know that it is a glorious means of grace.

3. *Religious association and conversation* is a powerful means of grace, and yet it is much neglected. Even when the disciples of Christ do fall into each other's company, how little of their time is spent in talking of Jesus—his death, his resurrection, his church, his cause among men. The world—its riches, its honors, its politics—these seem to fill our hearts, and therefore become the themes of our conversation. At a time of great apostasy among God's ancient, national people, "they that feared the Lord, spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels." Mal. iii, 16, 17. Now, as the Jewish kingdom was a type of the Christian church, many things that befel them "happened unto them for our ensamples," and they are written for our admonition. If, then, it was a means of gaining the favor of God, under that dispensation, for the Lord's people to speak often one to another on things pertaining to the kingdom of God, how much more is this practice necessary under the gospel dispensation.

4. *Publicly assembling* together is also an ordinance of grace. Hence the apostle teaches us not to "forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is." Heb. x, 25. And who can tell the influence of public meetings on any cause? Politicians have considered this, and have tried to bring the influence of public meetings to favor their respective causes. In all ages, holy convocations have stood as a means of grace among God's people. It gives energy and strength to the Christian, to meet and greet his brethren while on the highway to glory.

5. *Reading, or hearing the word of God*, in private, and especially in the assembly of the saints, is also an

ordinance of grace. In this way, the facts, commandments and promises of the gospel are brought to bear directly on our minds, our hearts are cheered, and we are enabled to run with patience the race set before us, looking to Jesus, who is the author and finisher of the faith.

6. *Singing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs* is another ordinance in the kingdom of Christ. Paul commands us to teach and admonish one another by this delightful exercise. Col. iii, 16; Eph. v, 19. This, too, is an ordinance of much power. Political men have seen the power of song, and have therefore called on the muses to aid them in their mighty struggles. But their themes fall as far below the holy themes of Christian song, as earth is below the heavens.

7. *Exhorting one another* is an ordinance of much importance in the church of God. The apostle commands attention to this means of grace, more and more, as the great day of the Lord approaches. How is the Christian's heart revived by the warm and faithful exhortations of those in whom he has confidence.

8. *The Lord's Supper* is an ordinance of grace, of much importance and lasting obligation in the church of the living God. In this institution, the unspeakable love of God, as manifested in the death of our Lord and Saviour, is brought directly before the mind of the disciple of Christ, and thus he considers him that endured such contradictions of sinners against himself, until he becomes so strong that he neither wearies nor faints in his mind.

These are some of the ordinances appointed by Divine wisdom as means through which to communicate that grace which we so much need. And we may suppose that it is to some or all of these that the apostle refers when he says, "Let us come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we

may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. iv, 16.

Now, suppose that each of these ordinances imparts an equal amount of grace, and we neglect one; then we lack one-eighth of the grace which we might possess. Suppose we neglect one-half of them; then our stock of grace is diminished one-half. But suppose some one of these means of favor imparts more grace than another, and we neglect that one, the loss is still the greater.

From this general view of the subject, it is not hard to tell why some professed christians complain so much of their want of grace. How often is it the case when we talk with persons on the subject of christian duty, that they will admit all we say in reference to what ought to be done, but they complain of their want of strength to perform the work. "O, I am so weak; my leanness, my leanness," is the common complaint. And this want of strength is not only urged as an excuse for the omission of duty, but also for the commission of crime. O, says the brother, when called upon by the elders of the church to know how he came to disgrace the name and cause of Christ, by acting so far out of the way; O, I am so weak and liable to err.

Now, I am inclined to think that in some instances, it is a crime to be weak. We are not only accountable for the proper use of the strength we have, but for that which we might have by the use of heaven's appointed means. To illustrate: Suppose a nobleman who has a number of hired servants in his employ; he assigns to them their several duties for a certain day, prepares all the sustenance necessary to meet the demands of their physical nature, and departs on business. At evening he returns and reckons with them. But it is found that they have not performed a moiety of the work allotted for the day. Their Lord asks

why this is so — they answer — O, our strength failed; we did all we could until we became so feeble that we could no longer endure. On being asked the cause of this unusual weakness, they reply, for want of food; when at the same time their Lord had prepared plenty, all spread out before them, and had told them on his departure, that it was provided for their special benefit, and that they were welcome to partake just as their strength required to be renewed; but they had willfully refused the offered provisions. Now I ask, are not these servants just as guilty of sin, as if they possessed the necessary strength, and failed to employ it in their Lord's service? Nay, they are not only guilty of a neglect of duty, but they have treated their Lord with contempt, and then charge their delinquency, indirectly, on him, thus adding iniquity to crime. They refused the offered strength, and then complain for the want of it, and make this *want* an excuse for disobedience.

Now make the application. The Christian is said to be made free from sin, and to have become the servant of God. Rom. vi, 18. The work he is required to do, is definitely pointed out in the holy scriptures. The means which he has appointed through which to communicate the grace, or strength necessary to perform the work, we have already noticed. Now, suppose the person professing to be a servant of God neglects these means; he but seldom prays in secret, and never in his family. He does not often read the Bible, and is but seldom found in the house of worship. He prefers to visit his neighbors on the Lord's day to assembling with the Lord's people around the Lord's Table. He soon begins to lack moral strength to discharge his Christian obligations, and now, when met by an enemy in the form of temptation, he is overcome. Will he now cry out, O my weakness, my weakness? Will he say he has failed for want of strength, and thus charge his crime on

the good Lord? Let us take care how we charge God with withholding his gracious aid. The Lord has said "I will never leave nor forsake you." "I will be a present help in every time of need;" "my grace shall be sufficient for you." But he has made his appointments when to meet us, saying, "where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," and if we fail to meet the Lord's appointments, we should not complain of his absence.

I have thought that some persons look upon attendance upon the ordinances of the Lord as being about all the work enjoined upon the disciples of Christ. This is a wrong view of the whole matter. We should look upon these ordinances as means of grace, and attend to them, not so much from the sense of *duty*, as from the consideration of the fact that through them we are to obtain strength to overcome the King's enemies, "and *having done all, to* STAND." We should wait on the Lord in these ordinances as a *privilege*, and rejoice that we have access to so many feasts in the Lord's house, by means of which we can renew our strength, until we can run in the discharge of duty without growing weary, and walk in the king's highway of holiness, and not faint. When we take this view of the subject, do we not feel like saying, with the ancient servant of God, "I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness?"

At this time there seems to be a general complaint among the congregation. The cause of God does not seem to be advancing as in former days. Recruits are not being made from the *enemy's ranks* as rapidly as heretofore. What is the matter? Is the Lord's arm shortened, that it can not save? Is his ear dull, that it can not hear? No, verily. The Lord is the same. His mind, gospel, and power remain the same. The cause of the failure must be

with us. Let all the disciples of Christ, then, into whose hands this little *Family Companion* may fall, examine themselves carefully in the light of the Lord's word. Have we all the moral strength we formerly had? Do we exert as much moral influence upon the camp of the wicked as we once did? If not, what shall we do? Shall we charge the failure on the Lord, and say that he has withheld his precious aid? And shall we, therefore, abandon the field? May the Lord forbid! No, brethren, let all return to the ordinances of the Lord's house, and to all the means of grace which he has ordained for our benefit, and thus, by waiting on the Lord, let us renew our strength, and then go to work like men of God, engaged in the most holy enterprise that ever occupied the attention of men or angels —the glory of God in the salvation of man.

It does seem to me that many persons have taken a wrong view of the grace of God, or they would not be so negligent in attending the ordinances of the Lord's house. From the view we have now taken of the ordinances of grace, what shall we think of a person who professes to be a disciple of Christ, and belongs to the congregation of the saints, but who very seldom attends the house of worship? Does not his conduct say that he does not feel his need of the grace of God? He says he intends to serve God acceptably, but he does not attend to the ordinances through which the Heavenly Father has promised to communicate his gracious aid to enable him thus to serve the Lord. How strong must that individual feel who can thus depend upon his own strength to conquer in the HOLY WAR!

But this is not the only inference drawn from this man's conduct. His practice says to the Lord: "O, Lord, I do not need thy grace—I do not want it; nay, Lord, I will not have it." Be astonished, O heavens! and let the earth

blush, to think that a poor dying mortal should ever give vent to such a sentiment!

But perhaps the reader is ready to say, I never entertained such a blasphemous idea. Then, my brother, if you are guilty of the neglect of which I have spoken, your practice speaks a language you did not intend. But that your practice expresses all that I have stated, a moment's reflection will convince you.

Admitting that the Lord has appointed the ordinances of his house as means of grace, may we not contemplate the God of all consolation as standing at the head of these institutions, saying, O, every one that thirsteth come unto me and drink; come to the ordinances intended to refresh your souls, and drink abundantly, that your strength may be increased, until you are enabled "to serve the Lord with reverence and godly fear." But you will not come. You will not attend to these means of grace. And yet you say you intend to live a Christian life. Is not this saying that you do not need the grace of God? That you can serve him acceptably without his grace? Nay, more, is it not saying to the Lord that you will not have his grace? And, worse than all, is it not offering a direct insult to the Majesty of heaven and earth?

Christian reader, did you ever think that when you could attend the meetings of the brethren, and the ordinances of the Lord's house, and neglected to do so, that you were saying to the merciful Saviour that you did not desire his aid? You would not treat a benevolent man thus. Let us, then, no longer trample upon the mercy of God, lest we die.

I have known persons, and churches, to enter into covenant to do better than they had done, and yet fail to do so. I have known the preacher to say to the congregation:

Now, all who are determined to live more religiously, and to be more entirely devoted to the service of the Lord, come and give me your hand. On this proposition, I have seen crowds come forward and give their hands, and thus, before heaven and earth, make a solemn vow that they would live more righteously. But, alas, I have seldom seen such vows paid. As a general thing, there has been but little improvement in the moral conduct of those who thus vowed. Now, I ask, why is this so? Were those who entered into the agreement, and failed, dishonest? I can not charge all that I have known to come short of such public covenants with hypocrisy. No, in most cases the reason of the failure was, they went into the agreement in their own strength, or, having made the vow, they relied on their own strength to perform it. They may have sung:

> "Lord, we depend upon thy grace,
> Oh, may thy spirit be our guide."

Still, they neglected the only means through which that grace is promised, and hence, they "*failed of the grace of God;*" and, failing of the grace of God, they failed to perform the promised service.

Some talk of the grace of God as if they thought it was some kind of ærial, metaphysical, incomprehensible something, that floats in the atmosphere, and just comes down upon an individual as the GOOD BEING directs, without the employment of any visible means whatever. Such persons are always talking about God's grace, but seldom feel its power. The apostle says: "*By grace ye are saved,*" and these persons think that this saving grace is bestowed without any effort on their part to obtain it. They neglect almost all the ordinances of divine favor of which we have spoken, until they become weary, and faint, and die.

Now, I believe, most confidently, that if we are saved at all, it must be accomplished by grace.

"Grace first contrived the way
To save rebellious man;
And all the steps, that grace display,
Which drew the wond'rous plan."

The whole gospel scheme is but one stupendous system of grace—of divine favor. And the strength necessary to the performance of every duty which is required of the Christian is to be conferred as a matter of grace—of pure benevolence on the part of our Heavenly Benefactor. But this grace comes through the means already pointed out in this discourse.

Then, I would advise all the members of the Church of God, instead of entering into public agreements to do better, without having any definite point before the mind, to enter into a solemn agreement with the Lord and one another, that they will give more attention to the means of grace than formerly; that they will more frequently commune with God in secret devotion and meditation; that those who are the heads of families will read God's Holy Word, and pray in their families daily; and that they will attend the ordinances of the Lord's house as often as it is in their power; that nothing that they can control shall prevent them from meeting with the Lord's people, in the Lord's house, on the Lord's day. And then let them consecrate the moral strength they thus obtain, to the service of God, with a willing heart.

Let me ask you who are reading this discourse, have you not often resolved in your own mind, to do better for time to come, and then failed, utterly failed, to comply with your private determinations? Cases of this kind are so common

that it has been reduced to poetry, and sung as a part of every Christian's experience:

> "Here I repent and sin again;
> Now I revive, and now I'm slain;
> Slain with the same unhappy dart,
> Which, oh! too often wounds my heart,"

has been sung over and over again, by many honest professors of Christianity. Thus they have their UPS and DOWNS; their winters and summers; their *chills* and *fevers* in religion. And worse than all, some charge all this fluctuation upon the good Lord, supposing that at one time he bestows his grace, and withholds it at another.

Thus did God's ancient people once complain. But he responded: "O, that you had hearkened to my commandments; then had your peace been as a river, and your righteousness as the waves of the sea," Is. xlviii, 18. By neglecting the commandments and ordinances of God, they fell into sin; and thus lost that peace which God alone can give.

Now the same principle stands good in the gospel dispensation. Hence you will always see that when these UP and DOWN Christians have times of prosperity in the good cause, they have been more attentive to these ordinances than they were when passing through the gloomy seasons of which they complain. And you will always observe that just before a great revival of the good work of the Lord there is a general returning to the ordinances of the Lord's house, on the part of the Lord's people.

As a matter of encouragement to all who are engaged in the service of the Lord, let us hear what the Lord hath said by his inspired servants: "Be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as you know that *your labor is not in vain in the Lord.*" "Be not

deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, *shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.* And let us not be weary in well doing; *for in due time we shall reap if we faint not.*" "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry and ye gave me meat," etc. You have been faithful over a few things, I will make you ruler over many things; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord." "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Now, in view of all the undying glories of God's eternal kingdom, who would not make an unwearied effort to "SERVE GOD ACCEPTABLY WITH REVERENCE AND GODLY FEAR."

SERMON XV.

WORDS.

For the ear trieth words, as the mouth tasteth meats.
Job xxxiv, 3.

I HAVE not read this text for the purpose of writing a sermon on the book of Job; or the life of Elihu, who uttered these words. My purpose is to make WORDS the theme of this discourse, and I have only placed this scripture at the head of the discourse, because this term is found in it. Any other passage in the Bible in which the term *word* occurs, may be equally regarded as my text.

There is nothing more common among the children of men than words. They are found in every man's mouth; they are being continually uttered by every lady; children are ever using words; the hearts of parents are always rejoiced when the little prattler first begins to articulate words; the first words spoken by the child in its mother's arms, are caught with great delight; and O, how we hang upon the last words of a dying friend. Our world is full of words; books are made up of words; all our epistolary communications are composed of words; the oldest and best book in the world is but an extensive combination of words. But after all, how few there are who properly consider the importance of words. There is perhaps nothing in all the market that is so common; and that is in such everlasting

demand, that is so lightly esteemed. Indeed, it has passed into a proverb, that, *words are cheap.*

From these considerations, I have concluded that *words* are of sufficient importance to make them the subject of a sermon in this little book of discourses.

I. First of all, let us define the term WORD.

1. "An articulate or vocal sound, or, a combination of articulate or vocal sounds, uttered by the human voice, and by custom expressing an idea or ideas."—Web. According to this definition we say that words are signs of ideas. They are only so, however, "by custom," or usage. Hence a new word communicates no idea to a person until he learns the idea intended to be expressed by it. Indeed this is true of all words. They are only the signs of ideas to those who understand their meaning; that is, the idea, of which they are designed, according to custom, to be the signs, or representative.

On this subject the apostle says, "Except you utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye speak unto the air. There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification. If, therefore, I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh, a barbarian; and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me." 1 Cor. xiv, 9, 10, 11. From this fact, Paul argues the importance of always speaking words easy to be understood, that by the voice, we may teach others also. Ver. 19.

2. The second meaning which Webster puts upon the term *word* is, "The letter or letters, written or printed, which represent a sound, or a combination of sounds." Inasmuch as the human voice can only be heard a short distance, and we can only articulate one sound at once, we can only speak to a few persons at the same time, and they must be near

us when we speak. Now, to overcome this inconvenience, and to enable man to speak to thousands, and tens of thousands of his fellow beings, scattered all over the country, men have agreed that certain marks, called characters, or letters, shall represent to the mind, through the eye, certain sounds; and that certain combinations of these characters shall represent certain articulate sounds or words. Hence, when a person who understands these characters, and the words which they, singly or combined, are intended to represent, sees these characters on paper, certain definite ideas are represented to his mind, though no real voice or sound be heard.

This is called written language, and is the most important invention of men, if indeed it be a human invention. I am inclined however, to the opinion, that as God gave man language, he also taught him to write; so that the art of writing may be of God, and not a mere human contrivance. But its importance, who can estimate? By this means, man can talk with his fellow man though in far distant lands; and nation can interchange thoughts with nation, though mighty oceans roll between.

3. But the term word also means, "a short discourse." The evangelist Luke uses it in this sense, in giving an account of some of the things that happened unto Paul at Rome, when taken thither as a prisoner for the hope of Israel. He sent for his Jewish brethren, and related to them the things for which he was brought to their city as a prisoner. They informed him that they had not heard any of these reports, and expressed a desire to hear something of the distinguishing peculiarities of the religious party with which Paul stood identified. But while he was setting forth their views, "some believed the things that were spoken, and some believed not. And when they agreed

not among themselves they departed, after that Paul had spoken *one word.*" Acts xxviii, 24, 25.

Here, the term *word* means more than one articulate sound. It means a short discourse, as the reader will see by examining the passage. Paul quoted a prophesy, and made an application of it.

4. Webster gives as a fourth meaning to this term, "talk; discourse." We use the term in this sense very frequently. How often do we say to a friend, I want a *word* with you? By this we mean a short conversation, or talk.

5. It is also made to signify "dispute; verbal contention." Hence, when persons have such a contention we say, "they had a few *words*, and parted."

6. But I cannot follow this mighty Lexicographer much further in his definitions; I will only name two more. "PROMISE." And in this sense we often use the term. If we have a man's promise for any thing, we say that we have his *word* for it.

7. The last meaning attached to this term that I will notice is, "The scriptures, divine revelation, or any part of it. This is called the word of God?" and it may be added, the word of truth; the word of life.

II. Having thus defined the term *word*, I will now state that there is a very close connection existing between a man and his word. It is hard to separate between them. In a certain sense, it may be said that a man and his word are one. We have already seen that *promise* is one meaning of the term *word*, and who can separate between a man and his promise? When a man makes you a promise, you say you have the man bound for the thing promised—or you have the man's promise, or word for it. Thus we use the word of the man for the man. If a man

denies his promise, we say he has denied himself. Of one known to do this, we would say, that man is not to be relied upon, or, that man's word is not to be relied upon. By these expressions we mean the same thing; and this shows how near a man stands related to his word.

When the apostle would express the immutability of the Lord's promise, he said, "He abideth faithful, he can not deny himself." Thus he would represent God and his word as one—for, denying his promise, would be denying himself. That mysterious union which exists between the Father and the Son, is illustrated by the union between a man and his word. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John i, 1. How near and how dear must be that union! If a man and his word are one, with what propriety may Jesus say, "I and my Father are one." As a man manifests himself, or the thoughts of his heart, in words, so, when "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," it was said, "God was manifest in the flesh." 1 Tim. iii, 16. And "we have seen with our eyes, we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life." 1 John i, 1.

Now, these things being so, how careful should we be in regard to our words. Just as men think of our words, they think of us. If our words are highly esteemed, we are highly esteemed; but if our words are disregarded in community, we are disregarded.

III. But I will now go one step farther, and say, *words are powerful things.* Yes, though words are only air in motion, or air manufactured into sounds, yet they exert a mighty influence in our world. Did you ever think, reader, that every word you utter produces some kind of influence upon the minds of those who hear it? And though the word may

have been pronounced in the twinkling of an eye, its influence may remain for many long years. Yes, and although we may have spoken those words carelessly, and thoughtlessly, and hence may think no more about them, in other minds they may long remain; and upon the feelings of other persons they may still be operating.

In view of the influence of words, Solomon says, "A soft answer turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger." Prov. xv, 1. How true this is. How often has it happened, that one man, filled with wrath, has approached the object of his hatred, and addressed him in an angry manner? But this man, being mightier than one who is able to take a city, because he keepeth his own spirit in subjection, answers his offending neighbor kindly, and softly; and that soft answer is felt—it operates like throwing water upon fire—it turns away his wrath—it quenches his burning anger, and the man is again in his right mind—he can now reason like a man. Now, this mighty effect was produced by words—kind, soft words.

And the last part of this proverb is equally true—"grievous words stir up anger." In this way, one angry man will sometimes operate upon a great number of persons. It has sometimes happened in communities, there has been a bad state of feeling. Much hardness has existed for a time; but matters have been adjusted; all parties seem to be satisfied, and the public mind, like the infant in its mother's arms, is sinking to rest, when some one utters "GRIEVOUS WORDS": these words fall upon the ear of some interested person, and they sink down into his heart, and he is all on fire again; and speaking from what is in his heart, he returns railing for railing; and through the medium of words, the influence runs from breast to breast, until the peace of a whole community is spoiled,

and all is strife and contention again. In this way, the peace of families is often very much disturbed. We find some families that seem always to be in a tumultuous confusion; every thing seems to be in everlasting uproar, while strife and contention is the order of the family. I have, in my peregrinations, fallen in with some such families, and I have always felt like "*asking leave of absence*," in such cases.

But the point that I wish to bring before your mind, dear reader, is that grievous words are the household words in such families. You will find that such words as stir up wrath, are almost constantly passing from father to son, and from son to father; from mother to daughter, and from daughter to mother; from brother to sister, and from sister to brother; and even from husband to wife, and from wife to husband. These grievous words stir up wrath, until the family is rendered a constant scene of strife and confusion.

But the influence of words is not confined to families and neighborhoods; it has often been felt in the church of God, to the great injury of the cause of Christ—to the disgrace of those who profess to be the followers of the blessed Redeemer.

But the influence of grievous words is not confined to families, neighborhoods, and churches. Whole nations and kingdoms have been convulsed by grievous words. The embattled hosts have been marshalled to the field of strife, and the glittering steel and the roaring cannon betoken the angry passions that burn in a nation's bosom—while the very earth is drenched with rivers of human blood, poured out in behalf of a nation's honor. Inquire for the cause, and it will be found that all this war and bloodshed has been produced by words. How powerful, then must words be. And still, it is said, that "words are cheap"!

Contemplating the influence of words, Solomon said: "The words of the pure are pleasant words." Prov. xv, 26. These pure words proceed from pure hearts, and they have a purifying influence. And, O how pleasant are such words! They fall softly upon the ear, and, like the morning dew upon the drooping flower, their influence distils gently upon the heart, and produces the most agreeable emotions.

Speaking on the same subject, the wise man says: "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver." Prov. xxv, 11. Now, an apple is beautiful, but a golden apple is more beautiful; but golden apples, properly set in a silver picture, is the most beautiful. Such, says Solomon, is a word fitly spoken. That is, the right kind of a word, spoken at the right time, and in the right manner. All this is implied in *a word fitly spoken.* We may sometimes speak at the right time, but speak the wrong word, and thereby do harm. Or, we may speak the right word, but speak it at the wrong time, and thus do harm. Or, we may speak the right word at the right time, but speak it in the wrong manner, and thereby do harm. Hence, there are three important items that should be well considered, and thoroughly understood by all—namely: when to speak, what to speak, and how to speak. And, by the *how to speak,* I do not refer to the grammar of the sentence uttered, so much as to the spirit and expression with which the thing is said. But I am wandering. My subject is *words,* and not *manners.* Still, I am not far from the subject, as the manner of saying a thing has much to do in giving influence to the words spoken. Some destroy their influence for good, by an abrupt, harsh, unfeeling manner of expressing themselves, even on the common affairs of life.

But let us hear the wise man again, on the influence of

words. He says: "The words of a tale-bearer are as wounds, and they go down into the innermost parts," etc. Prov. xviii, 8. O, how true this is! Dr. Clark infers from the original, that the character here referred to is the *two-faced*, or double-tongued man—"the fair-spoken, deeply-malicious man, though they appear *soft* and *gracious*, are wounds deeply injurious." Yes, the man that takes up an evil report against his neighbor, and peddles it in the community, often pierces the deep feelings of the heart. Such words of slander are like the sharp arrow shot by "a *certain man* at a venture," which pierced deeply into the loins of Ahab, king of Israel. O, how such words sting. Well may Solomon say: "The words of a tale-bearer are as wounds." They inflict painful wounds, which are hard to heal. Long standing friendships have been utterly dissolved by such words; while, on the other hand, angry passions, raging like a mighty tempest, have been hushed to silence by the powerful influence of words.

The apostle James compares the influence of words to fire. He says: "The tongue is a little member, but boasteth great things. Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth. And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity, so is the tongue among the members that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of hell." James iii, 5, 6. But the tongue does all this mighty work by the use of words. The tongue would never revolutionize the world, and fire the course of nature with the fire of hell if it had no power to utter words.

Even God's moral power is put forth in words. "Is not my word as a fire? saith the Lord, and as a hammer that breaketh the rocks in pieces?" Jer. xxiii, 29. Hence it is that God has always employed words for the conversion of sinners, and for the sanctification and encouragement of the saints. It is in view of this fact that the apostle said the

"gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all them that believe." Rom. i, 16.

Now, when we thus contemplate the power of words, and remember the fact that every word we utter is likely to produce some kind of influence on those who hear, how careful should we be in regard to our words! It is in view of the influence of our words that the following commands are given:

"Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few." Ecc. v, 2.

This may apply particularly to our prayers. Remembering that God is in heaven, and that we are poor, finite creatures, whose habitation is in the dust, we should not be rash when we appear before his throne of mercy in prayer. Our words should be few, and of an imploring character. We should not address the Almighty Father in the authoritative style of a master commanding a servant. We should always remember that there is a great difference between *commanding* and *praying*.

But this command may also apply to our general conversation. For, though God is in heaven, and we are upon the earth, yet his eyes are everywhere beholding the good and the evil. Prov. xv, 3. He hears all our words, and marks their influence, and holds us accountable for all their results.

Paul to Timothy gave the following advice: "Shun profane and vain babblings, for they will increase unto more ungodliness; and their *words* will eat as doth a canker." 2 Tim. ii, 16, 17. The point in this quotation to which we invite special attention is the effect of the *words* of these vain babblers. These words, says Paul, will eat as a canker. The word rendered *canker*, is *gangraina*, which means "a

gangrene, an eating sore, ending in mortification." Such are the words of these vain babblers. They operate upon the mind and morals of community, like a running sore upon the physical organism. They eat out all the peace of society, corrupt the moral atmosphere, vitiate the spiritual appetite, and, like mortification in the natural body, produce death in the mystical body of Christ, the church. How appropriate the advice of Paul to this young man, to shun these vain babblers—these unholy talkers, and perverse disputers—whose words have such a corroding, destructive influence. And would it not be well for us all to lay this counsel to our hearts?—remembering that "evil communications corrupt good manners."

To the same purpose is the following hint: "He that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips, that they speak no guile." 1 Peter iii, 10. That is, if a man would show his love of life, and enjoy good days, happy days, days of peace and harmony, in the church and in the world, let him refrain his tongue from evil words—words that eat like gangrene—words that burn, that set on fire the course of nature, even with the fire of hell. Well may the apostle say: "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace to the hearers." Eph. iv, 29.

To the same effect is the following apostolic admonition: "Be ye followers of God as dear children, and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savor. But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; neither filthiness, nor *foolish talking*, nor *jesting*, which are not convenient (or proper), but rather giving of thanks." Eph. v, 1, 2, 3, 4.

How often is this command trampled under foot by those who profess to be the followers of the Lord! How much of our precious time is worse than thrown away by foolish talking and jesting. It would seem that the most exalted idea that ever enters the minds of some persons is, how they can say some foolish thing, to excite mirth and laughter to the best advantage. Even some men of talents have consecrated all their mental powers to the vain amusement of a giddy world. To read their foolish anecdotes and crank sayings, one would think they had put their inventive faculties to the torture for the purpose of bringing out something novel—some new joke—in order to revive the organs of mirth in those who are overgorged with folly, and thus exite another burst of laughter.

What must be the reflections of such persons, when they come to a bed of death, and there, in view of eternity, reflect upon the labor and talent that they have thus squandered! What a vast amount of good might they have accomplished by the proper occupancy of these talents! Will not all such be declared unprofitable servants "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men's hearts, by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel?"

While on this point, I wish to say a word to professed Christians, in reference to what are called *by-words*. Do not think this a small matter, Christian reader. My text is WORDS, and therefore my sermon should have special regard to words, and even to *by-words*.

I have sometimes thought that some persons who have professed faith in Christ have been at great pains to provide themselves with a full stock of words to take the place of those very *hard words* which they used before they embraced the gospel. They will not now swear profanely, right square out, but they use other words as substitutes. They will not swear by the great Creator's name, but they

will swear by some king — James, or George, or by some other oath. Now, the swearing man of the world says, that man might just as well swear as I do, for he means the same thing. I have often heard that remark.

I have been utterly astonished; my feelings have recoiled, and I have almost shuddered, when I have heard members of the church use such words. I hope the reader understands what I mean. Or must I be more particular? Well, I refer to such words and expressions as the following: by George; by Jolly; by Jings; drot it; durn it, etc., etc. Now in these examples there is a direct violation of that command which says, "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath:" James v, 12. Some church members will even go so far as to use the name of the heavenly Father, and of the Divine Saviour, as mere *by-words;* as interjections by which to express great astonishment. My God; good Lord; God bless you, etc., etc. Now all such exclamations are profane; it is taking the name of God in vain, and they who do it shall not be guiltless, saith the Lord. O! how the cause of the blessed Saviour has been wounded and crippled by such inconsiderate disciples!

Speak to such persons about the impropriety of such expressions, and they will tell you they use these words and phrases without thinking! Worse and worse! A Christian take the name of the Lord in vain without thinking! A Christian should never speak without thinking; but especially should he think when he pronounces the name of the Holy One of Israel.

Shall we admit the power of words; that our words are always operating for good or evil, and then speak without thinking! May the good Lord enable us always to think, before we speak. Let every member of the church adopt David's rule. He said: "I will take heed to my ways that

I sin not with my tongue; I will keep my mouth with a bridle while the wicked is before me," Ps. xxxix, 1. "Behold," says James, "we put bits into the horses' mouth that they may obey us; and we turn about their whole body. Behold also the ships, which, though they be so great, and are driven by fierce winds, yet are they turned about with a very small helm, whithersoever the governor pleases," James iii, 3, 4. Thus should Christians govern the tongue. 'Tis true the tongue is a *world*—even a world of iniquity, which can not be tamed—yet it may be governed by proper attention, and by prayerful reliance upon the grace of God.

4. But I have one more suggestion to make in reference to words, and that is this: the power of a word is in its *idea*. This is true of all words, whether human or divine. We have seen that words are mighty things; that they produce tremendous effects; but their power is not in the mere articulate sound; it is in the idea which the sound conveys.

To illustrate: I may use very insulting language to a man, but if I speak in a language which he does not understand, he is not affected at all; and why? He does not get the idea. But let me take the same ideas and wrap them up in words which he does understand, and throw these words into his mind, and he is roused in a moment; his passions are all aroused; I have set on fire the course of his nature, and it is set on fire of hell. You say, my words have thus affected the man; but it was not the mere articulate sounds that did it; it was the idea of which these sounds are only the signs.

This thought will explain much that is said about the moral power of God's word. It does seem to me that this important fact has been overlooked in the controversy about the influence of God's word, in the conversion of sinners. The word of God is called the seed of the kingdom; this

seed produces the children of the kingdom. Hence, they are said to be "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word* of God which liveth and abideth forever," 1 Pet. i, 23.

Now, when you plant a grain of corn, you say it grows and produces the ear, and then the full corn in the ear; but it was not the bare grain that did it; it was the *germ* that was in the grain. You only planted the grain for the sake of the germ, or principle of life which it contained

So in reference to the word of God, which is the seed of the kingdom. The principle of life is in the *germ*, and the ideas which are embosomed in these words, are the germs.

The reader will find a full illustration of these ideas, what they are, and the influence they are designed to produce, at the close of the sermon on conversion, in this book, to which I now refer him.

5. I will state one more fact in reference to *our words*, and then close this discourse.

Our words will have much to do in settling our destiny, in the great and notable day of the Lord. Let the vain and thoughtless talker read the following declaration, made by Him whom God hath ordained to be judge of the living and the dead at the last day.

"O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man, out of the good treasures of his heart, bringeth forth good things; and an evil man, out of the evil treasures of his heart, bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For, by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned," Matt. xii, 34, 35, 36, 37. What a solemn thought! Well may the poet say, while

musing upon these words of the Saviour, and the tremendous scenes to which he here refers:

"And must I be to judgment brought?
And answer in that day;
For every vain and idle thought?
And every word I say?
How careful ought I then to live!
With what religious care,
Who such a strict account must give,
For my behavior here!"

Yes, dear reader, the word of the Lord being sure, we must give an account to the Almighty God for our very words. And this is no more than right, if our words are such powerful instruments for good or for evil.

The power of speech; the ability to communicate our thoughts to others, by the use of words, is the noblest gift of God to man, and it is but right that man should be held accountable for the use he makes of that power. Can any one suppose that He who made man, and gave him all the powers of body and mind which he possesses, has no will in reference to the way and manner in which these powers are employed? Such a conclusion would be most absurd.

If, then, the Almighty Creator has a will in reference to the occupancy of any of our talents or capacities, He must have a double regard to that power wherewith we may bless God, and wherewith we can curse man who is made in the image of God. That power by which we can still the angry passions of man; sooth the broken, wounded heart; comfort the mourner in the hour of deep distress; and lead the wanderer to the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world; or, with which we can destroy the peace of society; burn out the harmony of the church of God; alienate old and long tried friends; rouse the slumbering

passions of the human heart; set nation at variance with nation; and even set on fire the whole course of nature with the very fire of hell! I say, surely God has a double regard to the manner in which such powers as these are employed.

But still, He would have them employed. They are given to be used. The Lord would not have us remain speechless. I have heard of some persons who were so fearful of saying something wrong, that they would not speak at all. This is only choosing one of two evils. The servant who buried his Lord's money in the earth, was condemned, not for using his Lord's money improperly, but for not using it at all.

Then we should not bury our talents in the earth; we should bring them out, develop them, and consecrate them all to the service of God and humanity, and thus occupy them faithfully until our Lord comes to reckon with his servants.

May we all be prepared to hear him say, "well done good and faithful servants, enter into the joys of your Lord."

SERMON XVI.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept; for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrrection of the dead.

1 Cor. xv, 20, 21.

According to this scripture, our hope of a resurrection, and of eternal life, is based on the resurrection of Christ. And let it be here remembered, that the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ formed the theme of the preaching of the first proclaimers of the Christian faith. They even call these facts "THE GOSPEL." Hence, the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ is as old as Christianity. Wherever the Christian religion has been preached, the resurrection of Christ has been preached; and wherever the Christian religion has been believed, the resurrection of Christ has been believed.

Let us then examine the character and testimony of those who have deposed in reference to this fact.

And first, let us notice the witnesses who have testified against the resurrection of Christ. Who are they? They are the same who stood around the tomb in which that body was lain to prevent his friends from taking it away. They, then, had a fair opportunity of knowing the truth on this subject. Well, what do they say? "His disciples stole him away while we slept." Now, in weighing a man's testimony,

we always examine the motives that may operate on his mind while testifying. Had these witnesses any inducements to conceal the truth, and to make a false statement? We affirm that they had the strongest of motives. In the first place, their honor as soldiers was jeopardized. It would have been more honorable to them to report, that, overcome with weariness and long watching, they had fallen asleep, and that the disciples took advantage of this unguarded hour, and stole away the body, than to admit that it was taken by force, or that it was removed while they were wide awake and all attention, and they did not prevent it. But on the other hand, they had the promise of money if they would make the report of the case which they did make. Now I ask, what confidence can be placed in testimony, purchased with money? But the fact that they say that this theft was committed while they were asleep, destroys the force of their testimony with all reasonable persons.

But are any ready to say that this testimony never was given? that this is a tale made up by Christians? Why then did they not deny it at the time? And if they did not make this report, what report did they make? Having perfect knowledge of these things, they surely would have made some statements concerning them; and as this is the only report the world has ever heard from them, it must be the one they made. Remember, too, that this is part of the testimony of the witness of Christ, and that it was committed to record and published throughout that country, only five years after these facts are said to have occurred. And as they gave oral testimony, before their evidence was committed to writing, this account of the soldiers must have been published in Jerusalem, and among the very people who suborned the witnesses, immediately after these things took place. Now why did they not deny it? Is it

reasonable to suppose that they would have suffered a report which involved their honor and veracity, to have been published throughout the inhabited earth, beginning at Jerusalem, without even denying it, if they had known it to be false? Surely not.

But say that the soldiers never made this report, and then we have the testimony of the eye witnesses of our Lord and Saviour in favor of the resurrection of Christ, uncontradicted by any person having knowledge of these things. Now is it reasonable to suppose that a plain, sensible fact, such as the resurrection of a dead body, known by thousands, a fact which formed the basis of a new religon, which was to revolutionize the world, and destroy all other religions, could have been published in the face of the most inveterate enemies to that cause, among the wise and unwise, before courts, and ecclesiastical and civil councils, and no person deny it! no one be found who could, from his own personal knowledge, meet this report and show its falsity, if indeed, the facts had not existed!! Most unreasonable, such a conclusion.

But let us now inquire into the evidence which has been given in favor of Christ's resurrection. Two things should be always considered when we are called upon to decide a case upon given testimony; and no person is fit to act as juror in any case, who does not consider these two points. First; is the witness honest? Does he believe that the statements he makes are true? Second, are the facts about which he testifies of a plain tangible character, so that his senses could not have been imposed upon? Or, are they of an intangible, and metaphysical nature, so that the witness might be deceived? In cases of this kind, a person may be honest, and yet give false testimony. But say the witness is honest, that he believes what he says; and that the facts about which he testifies are of such a tangible

character that it was impossible for him to be deceived, and his testimony establishes the fact beyond the possibility of a lingering doubt. No verdict was ever given in any court on better testimony.

We inquire then, first; were the witnesses of Christ honest men? did they believe what they said? This question is to be determined by the circumstances of the case. Did they gain the world's goods by giving this testimony? If they obtained large earthly fortunes by testifying in favor of Christ's resurrection, this might have influenced them to make the statements they did, though they knew them to be false. But their history shows that this was not the case. Instead of gaining riches by their testimony, they lost what little they had. Did they gain the honors of the world by pursuing the course they did? We answer they did not. They brought upon them the reproach of the world, and all the ignominy and sarcasm, which a learned, influential, haughty nation could heap upon them. Were they promoted to easy circumstances by bearing the testimony they did? if so, this might have been their object. But all know that this was not the case. Instead of this they subjected themselves to persecutions, afflictions, imprisonments, stripes, buffetings, and even death itself, in its most horrid forms. One of these witnesses says, "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one, thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; In journeyings often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils by my own countrymen, in perils by the heathens, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness; in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." Yet, said he, "none of these things move me." In fact most

of the eye and ear witnesses of our Lord sealed their testimony with their own blood. Now, I ask, what but an honest conviction of the truth of the facts about which they testified, could have influenced them to suffer thus on their account? The reader will notice that we do not argue that their testimony is true because they suffered and died in defense of what they said. We know many have died for false religions. But we do argue from their sufferings, that they believed what they testified to be true. It is not in human nature to suffer all the afflictions, imprisonments, and deaths which were endured by the witnesses of our Lord and Saviour, for a system which they know to be false, and which promises them no earthly reward.

It will not do to deny that they suffered, according to the New Testament account. These facts are too well established to admit of debate.

The first question, then, concerning these witnesses, is answered—they were honest—this no man can deny. All the facts go to prove, beyond doubt, that they believed what they said.

We now inquire, was the fact of the resurrection of Christ, of such a nature that they could have been deceived? We can think of but three principles upon which a deception could have been practiced upon them. 1. Had they been but partially acquainted with him before his death, they might have mistaken some other person for him. 2. Or, if he had been absent from them a long time, they might have forgotten his general appearance, and thus have been deceived. 3. Or, if they had not a fair opportunity of identifying him, after his professed resurrection, they might have been imposed upon. If the person professing to be the Lord risen from the dead, had appeared to them in the night, or in twilight, and then only at a distance, their senses might have deceived them.

Now, as to their acquaintance with him before his death, it was of the most intimate character. They were his constant disciples and attendants, for some three and a half years. His person, his walk, his voice, his eye, the color of his hair, his countenance—yea, the very lineaments of his face—were well known by these witnesses, and just as firmly fixed upon the tablets of their memories, as anything possibly could have been. As to the second supposition, the time from his death until his first interview with these witnesses, after his resurrection, was not of sufficient length to have erased from their memory his general appearance. He was crucified on Friday, according to our manner of computing time, and arose and appeared unto some of them the next Sunday. They must have remembered their beloved friend most distinctly, during that short period of time. We then inquire, had they a fair opportunity to identify him, after he rose? Hear their own testimony on this subject; and remember, that we have already proven, by the strongest evidence that it is in the power of mortal man to give, that they were honest—that they believed what they stated to be true. Well, they say, "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, to see the sepulcher. And behold there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. * * * And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye, for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead, and behold he goeth before you into Gallilee; there shall ye see him. * * And as they went

to tell his disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshiped him." Matt. xxviii. Now, was it possible for these persons to have been deceived in these matters? They well knew the sepulcher in which the Lord was laid. They knew all about the stone which was laid at the door. Could they have been made to believe that that stone, which "was very great," was rolled back, and that they saw a heavenly messenger sitting upon it, and conversed with him, when the stone still remained sealed at the door? But others of these witnesses say, that when these women reported to the disciples that the body of Jesus was removed from the tomb, "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulcher. So they ran both together; and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulcher. And he, stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet he went not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulcher, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself." John xx, 3-7.

Now I ask in the name of reason, could they have been deceived in these matters? They must have been either deceived or deceivers. But we have proven that they were honest, and therefore not capable of fabricating and publishing such a story as we have in the last quotations from their testimony. It follows, then, that they must have seen and heard what is here stated; and if so, the weight of evidence so far, is in favor of Christ's resurrection. But let us follow their testimony a little further. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and

saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he showed them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad when they had seen the Lord. Then said Jesus to them, again, Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so I send you." John xx, 19, 20, 21. This case is too plain to admit the possibility of imposition. They see his face and hear his voice; they behold the wounds in his hands and side, and the subject of his address is the same that made up a part of his last communications to them before his passion. Compare the seventeenth chapter of John with the last quotation. But Thomas, one of the eleven, is absent, and when the disciples told him that they had seen the Lord, he said, "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." But on the next first day of the week, when Thomas is assembled with the other disciples, Jesus appeared in their midst. "Then said he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." From that time, Thomas would have died the most cruel death that could have been inflicted, rather than deny that Jesus was risen from the dead. Here imposition is out of the question. But add to this the fact that he associated with them, occasionally, for forty days, and talked with them about the kingdom of God. Had they been imposed upon, at first, under strong excitement, forty days was time enough for that excitement to subside; and certainly, during that long period, they had all opportunity of detecting the imposition, had there been any. But in his various interviews with them, he talks about the kingdom of God. How familiar

this was with them. It had been the subject of his instructions to them for about three and a half years, and now when he introduces the same subject, and talks about it in the same familiar style, it was well calculated to confirm their faith. Reader, have you not often met with old friends, whom you could not recognize until they would relate some particular conversation which they had had with you on some very interesting subject. But a mere reference to such a conversation would remind you of the very features of your friend who now stood before you. This advantage the witnesses under consideration enjoyed. There was no subject which lay so near their hearts as the kingdom of God; and now, when the Saviour introduced that subject, they would naturally look upon him with the greater attention, and if there had been any imposition in the whole transaction, they would have detected it at this point. But notice—these same good honest-hearted witnesses proceed still further, and testify, that during his last interview with them, "he led them out as far as Bethany, and he lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven. And a cloud received him out of their sight." Luke, xxiv, 50; Acts i, 9. Can we suppose, that while the Lord of these disciples was conversing with them, and pronouncing blessings upon them, he made them believe that they saw him arise from the earth before their eyes, and that they saw him ascending higher and higher, until he was lost from their vision behind the rolling clouds, when there was no reality in it? Was all this a mere deception? It can not be. They could not have been thus imposed upon.

Then what is the conclusion? Why, that Jesus did rise from the dead, and ascend to heaven. Yes, we are driven

to this conclusion. Admit that these witnesses were honest (and this we can not deny without the most glaring presumption), and then admit that they could not have been deceived in what they testified, and the point is settled beyond the reach of cavil. But these two points have been proved beyond the possibility of a lingering doubt; hence, there is no escape from the plain and natural conclusion, that Christ did "rise from the dead the third day, according to the scriptures." Yes, he has torn away the strong bars of death, wrested the keys of death and Hades out of the hands of him that held them, and planted the banners of life and immortality over the dark silence of the tomb.

Here, then, we raise our Ebenezer. Here we plant our hope. Around the cross and tomb of Christ our hopes cluster; here we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. Jesus having risen, them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. "He that raised up Jesus shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his spirit that dwells in us."

Before dismissing this subject, we will take one more view of the circumstances connected with the first proclamation of the resurrection of our Lord and Saviour.

That Christ lived upon our earth at the time the New Testament says he did, we presume no one will have the effrontery to deny; and that he was crucified under Pontius Pilate, can not be disputed by any reasonable man; and that his witnesses preached that he arose from the dead, and that they saw him ascend toward heaven, until a cloud received him out of their sight, but a few days after his death, admits of no dispute. Now that this preaching created no little stir among the people, is not only taught in the New Testament, but is perfectly reasonable, especially when we remember that they taught this doctrine as

the basis of a new religion, and the ground of salvation. All were interested in these things. The Jews saw in this doctrine the destruction of their religion, venerable for its antiquity, and honored for its rights and ceremonies; the Greeks saw in it the principles which would overthrow their whole mythology, with all its gods and demi-gods; the Christians saw in it their only hope of immortality and eternal life; so that all would have watched, with a jealous eye, the effects and success of the preaching of those who said: "*Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them slept.*" These things being so, it is evident that the body of Christ was not in the grave when Peter stood up in the midst of the eleven, and, in the hearing of listening thousands in Jerusalem, said, speaking of Christ: "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it."

Now, is it not reasonable to suppose that some one knew where that body was? If it was taken from the tomb by stealth, the theft must have been committed either by his friends or foes, and whoever took it must have known what disposition had been made of it. Suppose, then, that the enemies of this new religion had known where that body was—would they not have produced it? This would have been the most successful way of stopping the mouths of those whom they called *babblers.* It would have done more to put an end to this new superstition, as they called it, than all the imprisonments, stripes and deaths which they inflicted upon the advocates of the resurrection of Christ. But they did not do this, for the best of all reasons—they could not. Yes, reader, it is as certain as demonstration itself, that they did not know where that body was.

Well, suppose, on the other hand that the friends of

Christ had stolen away his body while the guard slept, would they have denied the fraud even unto death? Surely not.

Is it reasonable to suppose that Peter, who denied that he knew the Lord before he was crucified, when questioned by a timid damsel, and whose fear led him to confirm his denial with cursing and swearing, would have become so brave in a few days as to face the Jewish Sanhedrin, and all the Roman governors before whom he was brought, and, regardless of all their threats, not only affirm that he knew him, but that he had seen him after he rose from the dead! Can we suppose that among all who professed to have seen the Saviour after his resurrection, none of their hearts would have failed them when they saw that death was their inevitable portion if they did not confess the fraud?

Would all—old and young, male and female—have been so willing to suffer and die in defense of the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, when they knew all the time that they had stolen and concealed that body away in some secret place! No, verily; some of their company, for the sake of their friends, for the sake of comfort and ease, for the sake of property, for the sake of life, surely would have come forward and revealed the whole truth on the subject. It is certain, then, that they had not concealed away that body for fraudulent purposes.

If then, neither the friends nor enemies of Christ had that body in keeping, I ask, where was it? The only reasonable answer that can be given to this interrogation is found in these words: "And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a sepulcher. But God raised him from the dead." "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight."

Thus, the more we reflect upon the resurrection of Christ, the more firmly are we convinced of the fact that he did arise. The more we investigate all the circumstances of the case, aided by all the light of eighteen hundred years' experience, the more firmly is our faith in the resurrection of our blessed Lord established. Well may the inspired apostle exclaim: "BLESSED BE THE GOD AND FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, WHO, ACCORDING TO HIS ABUNDANT MERCY, HATH BEGOTTEN US AGAIN TO A LIVELY HOPE, BY THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD."

THE END

Y0-ARQ-125